arXiv:1608.06680v1 [math.AP] 24 Aug 2016

Dynamical Behavior for the Solutions of the Navier-Stokes Equation

Kuijie Li[†], **Tohru Ozawa**[‡], **Baoxiang Wang**[†,*]

[†] *LMAM, School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China,*

[‡] *Department of Applied Physics, Waseda University, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan*

Emails: kuijiel@pku.edu.cn, txozawa@waseda.jp, wbx@math.pku.edu.cn

August 25, 2016

Abstract

We study the Cauchy problem for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (NS) in three and higher spatial dimensions:

$$u_t - \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = 0, \quad \mathrm{div} u = 0, \quad u(0,x) = u_0(x). \tag{0.1}$$

Leray [33] and Giga [19] obtained that for the weak and mild solutions u of NS in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which blow up at finite time $T > 0$, respectively, one has that for $d < p \leqslant \infty$,

$$\|u(t)\|_p \gtrsim (T-t)^{-(1-d/p)/2}, \quad 0 < t < T.$$

We will obtain the blowup profile and the concentration phenomena in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $d \leqslant p \leqslant \infty$ for the blowup mild solution. On the other hand, if the Fourier support has the form supp $\widehat{u_0} \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : \xi_1 \geqslant L\}$ and $\|u_0\|_\infty \ll L$ for some $L > 0$, then (0.1) has a unique global solution $u \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, L^\infty)$. Finally, if the blowup rate is of type I:

$$\|u(t)\|_p \sim (T-t)^{-(1-d/p)/2}, \ for\ 0 < t < T < \infty, \ d < p < \infty$$

in 3 dimensional case, then we can obtain a minimal blowup solution Φ for which

$$\inf\{\limsup_{t \to T} (T-t)^{(1-3/p)/2} \|u(t)\|_{L^p_x} : \ u \in C([0,T); L^p) \text{ solves } (0.1)\}$$

is attainable at some $\Phi \in L^\infty(0,T; \ \dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty})$.

Key words: Navier-Stokes equation, concentration phenomena, blowup profile, minimal blowup solution.

MSC 2010: 35Q30, 76D03.

[*]Corresponding Author

1 Introduction

We study the Cauchy problem of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (NS) with initial data in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d \geqslant 2$:

$$u_t - \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = 0, \quad \mathrm{div} u = 0, \quad u(0,x) = u_0(x), \tag{1.1}$$

where $u = (u_1, ..., u_d)$ denotes the flow velocity vector and $p(t,x)$ describes the scalar pressure. $\nabla = (\partial_1, ..., \partial_d)$, $\Delta = \partial_1^2 + ... + \partial_d^2$, $u_0(x) = (u_1^0, ..., u_d^0)$ is a given velocity with div $u_0 = 0$. It is easy to see that (1.1) can be rewritten as the following equivalent form:

$$u_t - \Delta u + \mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u \otimes u) = 0, \quad u(0,x) = u_0(x), \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathbb{P} = I - \nabla \Delta^{-1} \mathrm{div}$ is the projection operator onto the divergence free vector fields. The solution u of NS formally satisfies the conservation

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \int_0^t \|\nabla u(\tau)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} d\tau = \frac{1}{2}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{1.3}$$

It is known that (1.1) is essentially equivalent to the following integral equation:

$$u(t) = e^{t\Delta} u_0 + \int_0^t e^{(t-\tau)\Delta} \mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u \otimes u)(\tau) d\tau \tag{1.4}$$

and the solution of (1.4) is said to be a *mild solution.* Note that (1.1) is scaling invariant in the following sense: if u solves (1.1), so does $u_\lambda(t,x) = \lambda u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x)$ and $p_\lambda(t,x) = \lambda^2 p(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x)$ with initial data $\lambda u_0(\lambda x)$. A function space X defined in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be a *critical space* for (1.1) if the norms of $u_\lambda(0,x)$ in X are equivalent for all $\lambda > 0$ (i.e., $\|u_\lambda(0,\cdot)\|_X \sim \|u_0\|_X$). It is easy to see that L^d and $\dot{H}^{d/2-1}$ are critical spaces of NS.

For the sake of convenience, we will denote by $NS(u_0)$ the solution of (1.1) (or simply denote it by u if there is no confusion), and by $T(u_0)$ the supremum of all $T > 0$ so that the solution $NS(u_0)$ exists in the time interval $[0, T]$.

Many years ago, Leray [33] showed that NS in 3D has at least one weak solution and he mentioned certain necessary blowup conditions for the weak solutions:

$$\|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{L^p} \gtrsim (T(u_0) - t)^{-(1-d/p)/2}, \ d < p \leqslant \infty. \tag{1.5}$$

The existence of the mild solution in L^p was established by Kato in [26] and the blowup rate (1.5) in all spatial dimensions was recovered by Giga [19] for the mild solution in $C([0, T(u_0)); L^p)$ with $d < p < \infty$. The blowup in the critical space $L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$ was first considered by Escauriaza, Seregin and Sverak [14] and they proved $\limsup_{t \to T(u_0)} \|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{L^3} = \infty$ if $T(u_0) < \infty$, similar results in critical spaces $\dot{H}^{1/2}$ and L^3 were obtained in [27, 17] via the profile decomposition arguments developed by Kenig and Merle [28] together with the backward uniqueness in [14]. Seregin [38] proved that $\lim_{t \to T(u_0)} \|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{L^3} = \infty$

if $T(u_0) < \infty$. Blowup results in L^d for higher spatial dimensions were obtained in Dong and Du [13] by following the approach in [14]. Recently, some generalizations for the blowup rates in $\dot{H}^s$ $(3/2 \leqslant s \leqslant 5/2)$ were obtained in [39, 12],

$$\|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} \geqslant c(T(u_0)-t)^{-(s-1/2)/2}, \quad d=3. \tag{1.6}$$

Some other kind of blowing up criteria can be found in Kozono, Ogawa and Taniuchi [32] and references therein.

On the other hand, there are some works which have been devoted to generalize the initial data in some larger spaces; cf. [3, 9, 10, 11, 21, 22, 25, 29, 34, 45] and references therein. For the initial data in critical Besov type spaces, Cannone [9], Planchon [34] and Chemin [10] obtained global solutions in 3D for small data in critical Besov spaces $\dot{B}^{3/p-1}_{p,q}$ for all $p < \infty,\ q \leqslant \infty$. Bourgain and Pavlovic [5] showed the *ill-posedness* (i.e., the solution map $u_0 \to u$ is discontinuous) of NS in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,\infty}$, Germain [18] proved that the solution map of NS is not C^2 in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,q}$ for any $q > 2$, Yoneda [46] showed that the solution map is discontinuous in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,q}$ for any $q > 2$, and Wang [44] finally proved that NS is ill-posed in critical Besov spaces $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,q}$, $1 \leqslant q \leqslant 2$. So, NS is ill-posed in all critical Besov spaces $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,q}$, $1 \leqslant q \leqslant \infty$. Up to now, noticing the embedding $\dot{B}^{-1+d/p}_{p,q} \subset BMO^{-1}$ $(p < \infty)$, the known largest critical space for which NS is globally well posed for small initial data is BMO^{-1}, see Koch and Tataru [29].

Before stating our main result, we first give some notations. $C \geqslant 1,\ c \leqslant 1$ will denote constants which can be different at different places, we will use $A \lesssim B$ to denote $A \leqslant CB$, $A \sim B$ means that $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. We denote by $L^p = L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the Lebesgue space on which the norm is written as $\|\cdot\|_p$. $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} = \|(-\Delta)^{s/2} f\|_2$ and $H^s = L^2 \cap \dot{H}^s$ for $s \geqslant 0$. Let us write for any $\rho > 0$,

$$\mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho} := \{\xi = (\xi_1, ..., \xi_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d :\ \xi_1 \geqslant \rho\}. \tag{1.7}$$

The standard iteration sequence for NS is defined in the following way:

$$u^{(n+1)}(t) = e^{t\Delta}u_0 - \int_0^t e^{(t-\tau)\Delta}\mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u^{(n)} \otimes u^{(n)})(\tau)d\tau, \quad u^{(0)} = 0. \tag{1.8}$$

We will mainly consider the concentration behavior of the blowup solutions and obtain a global well-posedness result in L^∞. The well-posedness of NS in L^p with $d < p < \infty$ was established in Giga [19]:

Theorem 1.1 *Let $u_0 \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ $(d < p < \infty)$ be a divergence free vector. Then there exists a time T and a unique solution $NS(u_0)$ such that the solution belongs to $\mathfrak{X}^p_{T(u_0)} := C([0, T(u_0)), L^p_x) \cap L^{p(1+2/d)}_{\mathrm{loc}}((0, T(u_0)), L^{p(1+2/d)}_x)$ and there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that $u(t)$ blows up at $T(u_0)$ and for any $0 \leqslant t < T(u_0)$,*

$$(T(u_0)-t)\|u(t)\|_p^{\sigma_p} \geqslant c_0,\ \sigma_p := \frac{2}{1-d/p}. \tag{1.9}$$

In Theorem 1.1 the left case is $p=\infty$. The Cauchy problem of the Navier-Stokes equations in L^∞ and in BUC spaces is studied by Cannone, Meyer [7, 8], Giga et al. [20] and they proved a unique existence of a local-in-time solution in L^∞ and in BUC spaces. In [20], the authors also obtained the smoothness of the solutions. We will obtain a concentration phenomena of the blowup solutions with initial data only in L^∞. The first main result of this paper is

Theorem 1.2 *Let $u_0 \in L^\infty$, $\mathrm{div} u_0 = 0$. Then there exists a $T(u_0) > 0$ such that (1.4) has a unique solution $NS(u_0) \in L^\infty([0,T(u_0)) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. If $T(u_0) < \infty$, then*

$$\omega(t) := \|NS(u_0)(t)\|_\infty \gtrsim (T(u_0)-t)^{-1/2},\ 0 \leqslant t < T(u_0). \tag{1.10}$$

For any $1 \leqslant p \leqslant \infty$, there exist $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t_n \nearrow T(u_0) < \infty$ such that

$$\|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{L^p(|x_n - \cdot| \lesssim \omega(t_n)^{-1})} \gtrsim \omega(t_n)^{1-d/p}. \tag{1.11}$$

Moreover, if $\mathrm{supp}\ \widehat{u_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho}$ for some $\rho > 0$ and there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that

$$4C(\|u^{(n_0)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} + \|u^{(n_0+1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}) \leqslant (n_0+1)\rho \tag{1.12}$$

for some $C \gg 1$, then (1.4) has a unique global solution $NS(u_0) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, L^\infty)$.

Let $\{x_{j,n}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\{\lambda_{j,n}\} \subset (0,\infty)$ be two sequences. $(\lambda_{j,n}, x_{j,n})_{n=1}^\infty$ $(j \in \mathbb{N})$ are said to be orthogonal sequences of scales and cores, if for any $j_1 \neq j_2$, $j_1, j_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, one has that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{j,n}}{\lambda_{k,n}} + \frac{\lambda_{k,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}} + \frac{|x_{j,n} - x_{k,n}|}{\lambda_{j,n}} \right) = \infty. \tag{1.13}$$

It is known that $\limsup_{t\to T(u_0)} \|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}} = \infty$ if $T(u_0) < \infty$ (cf. [14, 27, 17, 38, 13]). In the next result we describe the blowup profiles for the blowing up solutions.

Theorem 1.3 *Let $u_0 \in H^{d/2-1}$, $\mathrm{div} u_0 = 0$ and $NS(u_0) \in C([0,T(u_0)); H^{d/2-1})$ be the solution of (1.4) which blows up at $T(u_0) < \infty$. Let $t_n \nearrow T(u_0)$ satisfy*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}} = \infty.$$

Then there exist $\{\alpha_n\}$, $\{\phi_j\}$, $\{\lambda_j(t_n)\}$ and $\{x_j(t_n)\}$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n = +\infty$, $\phi_j \in \dot{H}^{d/2-1}$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_j(t_n) = 0$, $x_j(t_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $(\lambda_j(t_n)\}, \{x_j(t_n))$ are orthogonal, such that $NS(u_0)(t_n)$ can be decomposed into the following profiles:

$$NS(u_0)(t_n) = \alpha_n \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{\lambda_j(t_n)} \phi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j(t_n)}{\lambda_j(t_n)} \right) + r_n^J \right), \tag{1.14}$$

where r_n^J is a reminder that satisfies $\lim_{J\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|r_n^J\|_d = 0$, moreover, we have $\alpha_n = \|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}$, $\lambda_j(t_n) \lesssim \alpha_n^{-2/(d-2)}$ and in particular, for $p \geqslant 2$,

$$\sup_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d} \|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{L^p(|\cdot-\xi|\lesssim\lambda_j(t_n))} \gtrsim \lambda_j(t_n)^{d/p-1} \|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}. \tag{1.15}$$

Remark 1.4 Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 needs several remarks.

(i) Noticing that $\omega(t) \geqslant c\ (T(u_0)-t)^{-1/2}$, we have for any $p \geqslant d$,

$$\|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{L^p(|x_n-\cdot|\lesssim (T(u_0)-t_n)^{1/2})} \gtrsim (T(u_0)-t_n)^{-(1-d/p)/2}. \tag{1.16}$$

Taking $p=d$ in (1.16), we find that

$$\|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{L^d(|x_n-\cdot|\lesssim (T(u_0)-t_n)^{1/2})} \gtrsim 1, \tag{1.17}$$

which implies that the solution has a concentration in a very small ball with radius less than or equals to $C\sqrt{T(u_0)-t_n}$ in L^d.

(ii) Taking $p=d$ in (1.15) and noticing that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}=\infty$, we have

$$\sup_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d}\|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{L^d(|\cdot-\xi|\lesssim\lambda_j(t_n))} \gtrsim \|u(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}, \tag{1.18}$$

which means that a very large potential norm is concentrated in a very small ball with radius less than or equals to $C\|NS(u_0)(t_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}^{-2/(d-2)}$. However, up to now, it is not very clear for us how to unify the concentration phenomena of (1.17) and (1.18).

(iii) In the blowup profile decomposition (1.14), noticing that $\lambda_j(t_n)\to 0$ as $t_n \nearrow T(u_0)$, we see that concentration blowup is the only way in all of the possible blowing up manners.

(iv) Taking $n_0=0$ in (1.12), we see that condition (1.12) can be substituted by the following condition:

$$4C\|u_0\|_\infty \leqslant \rho. \tag{1.19}$$

Noticing that $\widehat{u_0}$ is supported in $\mathbb{R}_{+,\rho}$, we see that condition (1.19) contains a class of large data in L^∞ if $\rho \gg 1$ which are out of the control of $\dot{B}^{-1+d/p}_{p,q}$ with $p<\infty$.

Following [14, 27, 17], we see that, for the initial data u_0 in the critical spaces $X=\dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}^3),\ L^3(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the solution $NS(u_0)$ enjoys the property

$$\sup_{0<t<T(u_0)}\|NS(u_0)\|_X<\infty \quad\Longrightarrow\quad T(u_0)=\infty. \tag{1.20}$$

We can further ask what happens if X is a sub-critical spaces, say $X=\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^3),\ s>1/2$, or $X=L^p(\mathbb{R}^3),\ p>3$. Noticing the blowup rate as in (1.6), we have the following question in H^s:

$$T(u_0)<\infty \Longrightarrow \limsup_{t\to T(u_0)}(T(u_0)-t)\|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^{\sigma_s}=\infty?\ (\sigma_s=\frac{2}{s-1/2})$$

E. Poulon [37] first considered such a kind of question and she introduced

$$M_c^{\sigma_s} := \inf_{\substack{u_0\in\dot{H}^s\\ T(u_0)<\infty}} \{\limsup_{t\to T(u_0)}(T(u_0)-t)\|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^{\sigma_s}\}.$$

If $M_c^{\sigma_s} < \infty$, E. Poulon proved that $M_c^{\sigma_s}$ can be attainable for some $u_0 \in \dot{H}^s$ and the corresponding solution is uniformly bounded in critical Besov space $\dot{B}^{1/2}_{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Following Theorem 1.1, we can define similar critical "minimal" quantity adapted to the $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ scale for $3 < p < \infty$ ($\sigma_p = 2/(1-3/p)$):

$$M_c^{\sigma_p} := \inf\left\{\limsup_{t\to T(u_0)}(T(u_0)-t)\|NS(u_0)\|_p^{\sigma_p} : u_0 \in L^p,\ T(u_0)<\infty\right\}.$$

If $M_c^{\sigma_p} < \infty$, Giga's Theorem 1.1 implies that there exists $u_0 \in L^p$ such that the solution of NS blows up at finite time $T(u_0)$ with the blowing up rate

$$\|NS(u_0)(t)\|_p \sim (T(u_0)-t)^{-(1-3/p)/2},\ 0 \leqslant t < T(u_0).$$

Such a kind of solution is said to be type-I blowing up solution (cf. [31]). We have the following result:

Theorem 1.5 *Let $d = 3$, $3 < p < \infty$, $M_c^{\sigma_p} < \infty$. Then there exists a $\Phi_0 \in L^p \cap \dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}$ such that $\Phi := NS(\Phi_0)$ blows up at time 1, and satisfies*

$$\sup_{0<\tau<1}(1-\tau)\|\Phi(\tau)\|_p^{\sigma_p} = \limsup_{\tau\to 1}(1-\tau)\|\Phi(\tau)\|_p^{\sigma_p} = M_c^{\sigma_p}. \tag{1.21}$$

Moreover, Φ lies in Besov spaces $\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}$, and

$$\sup_{0<\tau<1}\|\Phi(\tau)\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}} < \infty. \tag{1.22}$$

1.1 Besov spaces

Let $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$ be a smooth cut-off function which equals 1 on the closed ball $B(0,5/4) := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \leq 5/4\}$ and equals 0 outside the ball $B(0,3/2)$. Write

$$\varphi(\xi) := \psi(\xi) - \psi(2\xi),\quad \varphi_j(\xi) = \varphi(2^{-j}\xi), \tag{1.23}$$

$\triangle_j := \mathscr{F}^{-1}\varphi_j\mathscr{F},\ j \in \mathbb{Z}$ are said to be the dyadic decomposition operators. One easily sees that $\mathrm{supp}\varphi_j \subset B(0,2^{j+1}) \setminus B(0,2^{j-1})$. For convenience, we denote

$$P_{\leq M}f := \mathscr{F}^{-1}\psi(\cdot\ /M)\mathscr{F},\quad P_{\geqslant M} := I - P_{\leq M}f. \tag{1.24}$$

The norms in homogeneous Besov spaces are defined as follows:

$$\|f\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,q}} = \left(\sum_{j=-\infty}^{+\infty} 2^{jsq}\|\triangle_j f\|_p^q\right)^{1/q},\quad \|f\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,\infty}} = \sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{jsq}\|\triangle_j f\|_p. \tag{1.25}$$

Using the heat kernel, we have (see [6, 40])

$$\|u\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,q}} \sim \left\|t^{-\frac{s}{2}}\|e^{t\Delta}u\|_p\right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^+,\frac{dt}{t})}, \quad s<0. \tag{1.26}$$

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we consider the well-posedness and blowup concentration of NS in L^∞ and prove Theorem 1.2. Using the "profile decomposition" techniques, in Section 3 we consider the blowup profile for the blowing up solution in $H^{d/2-1}$ and show Theorem 1.3. In Section 5 we will prove our Theorem 1.5, whose proof consists of two steps, constructing a critical solution in L^p and $\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}$ respectively. The proof of Theorem 1.5 relies upon a profile structure theorem, whose proof will be given in Sections 6 and 7. Finally, in the Appendix, we state some basic estimates on NS and prove a perturbation result which is useful in obtaining the estimate of the remainder term in the profile structure theorem.

2 Initial data in L^∞

2.1 Local well-posedness and blowup analysis

We will frequently use the following Bernstein's multiplier estimate (see [4, 42]):

Lemma 2.1 (Multiplier estimate) *Let $L\in\mathbb{N}$, $L>n/2$, $\theta=n/2L$. We have*

$$\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\rho\|_1 \lesssim \|\rho\|_2^{1-\theta}\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \|\partial_i^L\rho\|_2^\theta\right). \tag{2.1}$$

Recall that (see [10])

$$\left\|\triangle_j e^{t\Delta}f\right\|_r \lesssim e^{-t2^{2j-4}}\|f\|_r, \quad j\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.2}$$

Similarly, we have

Lemma 2.2 (Exponential decay) *Let $1\le r\le\infty$. We have*

$$\left\|\triangle_j(-\Delta)^{-1}\partial_\lambda\partial_\mu\partial_\nu e^{t\Delta}f\right\|_r \lesssim 2^j e^{-t2^{2j-4}}\|f\|_r, \quad j\in\mathbb{Z}, \quad 1\le\lambda,\mu,\nu\le d. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. The idea follows from [10] (see also [42]). By Young's inequality, we have

$$\left\|\triangle_j(-\Delta)^{-1}\partial_\lambda\partial_\mu\partial_\nu f\right\|_r \leqslant \left\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\left(\varphi_j\frac{\xi_\lambda\xi_\mu\xi_\nu}{|\xi|^2}e^{-t|\xi|^2}\right)\right\|_1\|f\|_r \tag{2.4}$$

By scaling argument and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\left\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\left(\varphi_j\frac{\xi_\lambda\xi_\mu\xi_\nu}{|\xi|^2}e^{-t|\xi|^2}\right)\right\|_1 = 2^j\left\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\left(\varphi\frac{\xi_\lambda\xi_\mu\xi_\nu}{|\xi|^2}e^{-t2^{2j}|\xi|^2}\right)\right\|_1 \lesssim 2^j e^{-t2^{2j-4}}. \tag{2.5}$$

In view of (2.4) and (2.5), we immediately have (2.3). □

For convenience, we denote

$$(\mathscr{A}_{t_0}f)(t) := \int_{t_0}^t e^{(t-\tau)\Delta}f(\tau)d\tau. \tag{2.6}$$

Lemma 2.3 (Decay of higher frequency) *Assume that* supp $\widehat{f} \subset \{\xi : \ |\xi| \geqslant 2^{j_0}\}$. *Then we have*

$$\|\mathscr{A}_{t_0}\mathbb{P}\nabla f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 2^{-j_0}\|f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. By the dyadic decomposition,

$$f = \sum_{j\geqslant j_0-1} \triangle_j f. \tag{2.8}$$

Using Lemma 2.2, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathscr{A}_{t_0}\mathbb{P}\nabla f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leqslant \sum_{j\geqslant j_0-1} \|\triangle_j \mathscr{A}_{t_0}\mathbb{P}\nabla f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j\geqslant j_0-1} 2^j \mathrm{sup}_{\mathrm{t}\geqslant \mathrm{t}_0} \int_{t_0}^t e^{-(t-\tau)2^{2j-4}}\|f(\tau)\|_\infty d\tau \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j\geqslant j_0-1} 2^{-j} \mathrm{sup}_{\mathrm{t}\geqslant \mathrm{t}_0} \left(1-e^{-(t-t_0)2^{2j-4}}\right)\|f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&\lesssim 2^{-j_0}\|f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

The result follows. □

Lemma 2.4 (Short time estimates of lower frequency) *Let* $j_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. *We have for any* $f \in L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\left\|P_{\leq 2^{j_0}}\mathscr{A}_{t_0}\mathbb{P}\nabla f\right\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 2^{j_0}(t_1-t_0)\|f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. Since $e^{-t|\xi|^2}(\xi_j\xi_k\xi_l|\xi|^{-2}) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $t>0$, whose Fourier transform has an integral form, it follows that

$$\mathscr{F}^{-1}(e^{-t|\xi|^2}\xi_j\xi_k\xi_l|\xi|^{-2}) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \triangle_j \mathscr{F}^{-1}(e^{-t|\xi|^2}\xi_j\xi_k\xi_l|\xi|^{-2}). \tag{2.11}$$

By Lemma 2.2 and (2.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|P_{\leq 2^{j_0}}\mathscr{A}_{t_0}\mathbb{P}\nabla f\right\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leqslant \sum_{j\leqslant j_0+1} \|\triangle_j \mathscr{A}_{t_0}\mathbb{P}\nabla f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j\leqslant j_0+1} 2^j \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \|f(\tau)\|_\infty d\tau \\
&\lesssim 2^{j_0}(t_1-t_0)\|f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

which is the result, as desired. □

Lemma 2.5 (Local well posedness) *Let* $u_0 \in L^\infty$ *with* $\mathrm{div} u_0 = 0$. *There exists a* $T>0$ *such that* (1.4) *has a unique solution* $NS(u_0) \in L^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$. *If* $T<\infty$, *then we have* $\lim_{t\to T}\|NS(u_0)(t)\|_\infty = \infty$ *and* (1.10) *holds true.*

Proof. The proof of the local existence can be found in [20]. However, the blowup rate (1.10) is very important for our later purpose and we sketch the proof here. Put

$$\mathscr{D} = \{u \in L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d):\ \|u\|_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \le 2C\|u_0\|_\infty\} \tag{2.13}$$

with natural metric $d(u,v) = \|u-v\|_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}$. Let us consider the mapping

$$\mathscr{T} : u(t) \to e^{t\Delta}u_0 + \mathscr{A}_0\mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u\otimes u). \tag{2.14}$$

Using $e^{t\Delta} : L^\infty \to L^\infty$, and Lemmas (2.3) and (2.4), we have

$$\|\mathscr{T}u\|_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \leqslant C\|u_0\|_\infty + C(2^{-j_0} + t_0 2^{j_0})\|u\|^2_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{2.15}$$

Taking j_0 such that $2^{-2j_0} \sim t_0$, one has that

$$\|\mathscr{T}u\|_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \leqslant C\|u_0\|_\infty + C\sqrt{t_0}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{2.16}$$

Similarly,

$$\|\mathscr{T}u - \mathscr{T}v\|_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \leqslant C\sqrt{t_0}\left(\sum_{w=u,v}\|w\|_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}\right)\|u-v\|_{L^\infty([0,t_0]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{2.17}$$

Further, one can choose t_0 verifying

$$\sqrt{t_0} = 1/(8C^2\|u_0\|_\infty). \tag{2.18}$$

We easily see that $\mathscr{T}$ is a contraction mapping from $\mathscr{D}$ into itself. So, $\mathscr{T}$ has a unique fixed point in $\mathscr{T}$, which is a solution of (1.4). It is easy to see that $u \in C((0,T];L^\infty)$ (see [20], for instance). The solution can be extended exactly in the same way as above. Indeed, considering the mapping:

$$\mathscr{T}_1 : u(t) \to e^{(t-t_0)\Delta}u(t_0) + \mathscr{A}_{t_0}\mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u\otimes u), \tag{2.19}$$

one has that

$$\|\mathscr{T}_1 u\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \leqslant C\|u(t_0)\|_\infty + C\sqrt{t_1-t_0}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{2.20}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathscr{T}_1 u - \mathscr{T}_1 v\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ &\quad\leqslant C\sqrt{t_1-t_0}\left(\sum_{w=u,v}\|w\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}\right)\|u-v\|_{L^\infty([t_0,t_1]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

So, we can extend the solution from $[0,t_0]$ to $[t_0,t_1]$ if

$$\sqrt{t_1-t_0} = 1/(8C^2\|u(t_0)\|_\infty). \tag{2.22}$$

Repeating the procedure as above, we can extend the solution step by step to $[t_1, t_2]$, $[t_2, t_3]$, ... if

$$\sqrt{t_i - t_{i-1}} = 1/(8C^2\|u(t_{i-1})\|_\infty), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots . \tag{2.23}$$

Now let us assume that $t_i \nearrow T$. If $T < \infty$, we easily see that $\limsup_{t\to T} \|NS(u_0)(t)\|_\infty = \infty$. Moreover, we can show (1.10) holds true. Assume for a contrary that there exist two sequences $s_n \nearrow T$ and $c_n \searrow 0$ satisfying

$$\|NS(u_0)(s_n)\|_\infty \leqslant c_n(T - s_n)^{-1/2}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots . \tag{2.24}$$

Observing the integral equation

$$u(t) = e^{(t-s_n)\Delta} NS(u_0)(s_n) + \mathscr{A}_{s_n}\mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u \otimes u), \tag{2.25}$$

similarly as in (2.20), we have for any $s_n \leqslant s < T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^\infty([s_n,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leqslant C\|NS(u_0)(s_n)\|_\infty + C\sqrt{s - s_n}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty([s_n,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leqslant Cc_n(s - s_n)^{-1/2} + C\sqrt{s - s_n}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty([s_n,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

(2.26) implies that

$$\sqrt{s - s_n}\|u\|_{L^\infty([s_n,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \leqslant Cc_n + C(\sqrt{s - s_n}\|u\|_{L^\infty([s_n,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d)})^2. \tag{2.27}$$

It follows from (2.27) that

$$\sqrt{s - s_n}\|u\|_{L^\infty([s_n,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \geqslant 1/2C, \quad or \quad \sqrt{s - s_n}\|u\|_{L^\infty([s_n,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d)} \leqslant 2Cc_n. \tag{2.28}$$

Taking $c_n \ll 1$ and $s \to T$, we see that (2.28) contradicts with (2.24) or with the fact that $\limsup_{t\to T} \|NS(u_0)(t)\|_\infty = \infty$. □

Lemma 2.6 (Concentration) *Let $T < \infty$ and $NS(u_0) \in L^\infty([0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ be the solution of (1.4) obtained in Lemma 2.5. Then for any $1 \leq p < \infty$, there exist two sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{\tau_n\}$ of $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tau_n \nearrow T$ satisfying*

$$\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{L^p(|x_n - \cdot| \lesssim \omega(\tau_n)^{-1})} \gtrsim \omega(\tau_n)^{1-d/p}, \quad \omega(t) = \|NS(u_0)(t)\|_\infty. \tag{2.29}$$

Proof. Put $\tau_0 = 0$. Since $\lim_{t\to T} \omega(t) = \infty$, we can find a $t_1 > \tau_0$ such that

$$\omega(t_1) \geqslant 200C^2\omega(\tau_0). \tag{2.30}$$

We can further find a $\tau_1 \in (\tau_0, t_1]$ verifying

$$\omega(\tau_1) \geqslant \frac{1}{2} \sup_{t\in[\tau_0,t_1]} \omega(t). \tag{2.31}$$

Then we have

$$\omega(\tau_1) \geqslant \max\left\{100C^2\omega(\tau_0),\ \ \frac{1}{2}\sup_{t\in[\tau_0,\tau_1]}\omega(t)\right\}. \tag{2.32}$$

Repeating this procedure, one can choose a monotone sequence $\{\tau_n\}$ verifying

$$\omega(\tau_n) \geqslant \max\left\{100C^2\omega(\tau_{n-1}),\ \ \frac{1}{2}\sup_{t\in[\tau_{n-1},\tau_n]}\omega(t)\right\}. \tag{2.33}$$

Since $\omega(\tau_n)\to\infty$, we have $\tau_n \nearrow T$.

Claim. For simplicity, we write $u := NS(u_0)$. We have

$$\|P_{\leqslant 100C\omega(\tau_n)}u(\tau_n)\|_\infty \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\omega(\tau_n). \tag{2.34}$$

In fact, if (2.34) does not hold, then one has that

$$\|P_{>100C\omega(\tau_n)}u(\tau_n)\|_\infty \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\omega(\tau_n). \tag{2.35}$$

Let us consider the integral equation

$$u(t) = e^{(t-\tau_{n-1})\Delta}u(\tau_{n-1}) + \mathscr{A}_{\tau_{n-1}}\mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u\otimes u). \tag{2.36}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.3 and (2.35) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(\tau_n) &\leqslant 2\|P_{>100C\omega(\tau_n)}u(\tau_n)\|_\infty\\
&\leqslant 2C\|P_{>100C\omega(\tau_n)}u(\tau_{n-1})\|_\infty + 2\|P_{>100C\omega(\tau_n)}\mathscr{A}_{\tau_{n-1}}\mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u\otimes u)\|_{L^\infty([\tau_{n-1},\tau_n]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
&\leqslant 2C^2\|u(\tau_{n-1})\|_\infty + \frac{1}{50\omega(\tau_n)}\|u\|^2_{L^\infty([\tau_{n-1},\tau_n]\times\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{50}\omega(\tau_n) + \frac{4}{50}\omega(\tau_n) < \frac{1}{2}\omega(\tau_n).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

A contradiction! So, we have (2.34). For convenience, we write

$$\beta(t) := 100C\omega(t) = 100C\|u(t)\|_\infty. \tag{2.38}$$

Now we prove (2.29). There exists $x_n\in\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_{\leqslant\beta(\tau_n)}u(\tau_n)\|_\infty \leqslant& 2\beta(\tau_n)^d\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\mathscr{F}^{-1}\psi)(\beta(\tau_n)(x_n-y))u(\tau_n,y)dy\right|\\
\leqslant& 2\beta(\tau_n)^d\left|\int_{|x_n-y|\leqslant M\beta(\tau_n)^{-1}}(\mathscr{F}^{-1}\psi)(\beta(\tau_n)(x_n-y))u(\tau_n,y)dy\right|\\
&+2\beta(\tau_n)^d\left|\int_{|x_n-y|\geqslant M\beta(\tau_n)^{-1}}(\mathscr{F}^{-1}\psi)(\beta(\tau_n)(x_n-y))u(\tau_n,y)dy\right|\\
:=& I + II.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.39}$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$II \leqslant 2\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\psi\|_{L^1(|\cdot|\geqslant M)}\|u(\tau_n)\|_\infty \leqslant 4\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\psi\|_{L^1(|\cdot|\geqslant M)}\|P_{\leqslant\beta(\tau_n)}u(\tau_n)\|_\infty. \tag{2.40}$$

Taking a suitable $M \gg 1$, one easily sees that

$$II \leqslant \frac{1}{4}\|P_{\leqslant\beta(\tau_n)}u(\tau_n)\|_\infty. \tag{2.41}$$

So, it follows from (2.41) and Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_{\leqslant\beta(\tau_n)}u(\tau_n)\|_\infty \leqslant& 4\beta(\tau_n)^d\left|\int_{|x_n-y|\leqslant M\beta(\tau_n)^{-1}}(\mathscr{F}^{-1}\psi)(\beta(\tau_n)(x_n-y))u(\tau_n,y)dy\right|\\ \lesssim& \beta(\tau_n)^{d/p}\|u(\tau_n)\|_{L^p(|x_n-\cdot|\leqslant M\beta(\tau_n)^{-1})}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

So, From (2.34) and (2.42) we immediately have the result, as desired. □

2.2 Global well-posedness

For convenience, we denote

$$\mathscr{B}(u,v) = \int_0^t e^{(t-\tau)\Delta}\mathbb{P}\ \mathrm{div}(u\otimes v)(\tau)d\tau. \tag{2.43}$$

By Lemma 2.3, we have

Lemma 2.7 (Decay with frequency superposition) *Let* supp $\widehat{u_i} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho_i}$, $i = 1, 2$. *Then we have* supp $\widehat{\mathscr{B}(u_1,u_2)} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho_1+\rho_2}$ *and*

$$\|\mathscr{B}(u_1,u_2)\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant C(\rho_1+\rho_2)^{-1}\prod_{i=1}^2\|u_i\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}. \tag{2.44}$$

Let us recall the iteration sequence

$$\begin{aligned}&u^{(0)} = 0,\quad u^{(1)}(t) = e^{t\Delta}u_0,\\ &u^{(n+1)}(t) = e^{t\Delta}u_0 - \mathscr{B}(u^{(n)},u^{(n)}),\ n = 1,2,\dots\ .\end{aligned} \tag{2.45}$$

Lemma 2.8 (Frequency superposition of higher iteration terms) *Let* supp $\widehat{u_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho}$. *Then we have*

$$\text{supp }\widehat{u^{(n)}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho},\quad \text{supp }\widehat{(u^{(n+1)}-u^{(n)})} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,(n+1)\rho}. \tag{2.46}$$

Proof. By (2.45), supp $\widehat{u_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho}$ and induction we see that supp $\widehat{u^{(n)}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho}$. Let us observe that

$$(u^{(n+1)}-u^{(n)}) = \mathscr{B}(u^{(n-1)}-u^{(n)},\ u^{(n)}) + \mathscr{B}(u^{(n-1)},\ u^{(n-1)}-u^{(n)}) \tag{2.47}$$

and

$$(u^{(2)} - u^{(1)}) = -\mathscr{B}(e^{t\Delta}u_0,\ e^{t\Delta}u_0). \tag{2.48}$$

By (2.48) and supp $\widehat{u_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho}$, we see that supp $(u^{(2)} - u^{(1)})\widehat{\ } \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,2\rho}$. By supp $\widehat{u^{(n)}} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho}$ and induction, it follows from (2.47) that (2.46) holds true. □

Lemma 2.9 (Compactness of Iteration) *Let* supp $\widehat{u_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^d_{+,\rho}$. *Assume that there exists* $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that*

$$M_0 := \|u^{(n_0)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} + \|u^{(n_0+1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant \frac{(n_0+1)\rho}{8C}. \tag{2.49}$$

Then $\{u^{(n)}\}$ *is a Cauchy sequence in* $L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}$.

Proof. By (2.47), we have for any $n > n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^{(n+1)} - u^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} =& \|\mathscr{B}(u^{(n)} - u^{(n-1)},\ u^{(n)})\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \\ &+ \|\mathscr{B}(u^{(n-1)},\ u^{(n)} - u^{(n-1)})\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

By Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8, it follows from (2.50) that

$$\|\mathscr{B}(u^{(n)} - u^{(n-1)},\ u^{(n)})\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant \frac{C}{(n+1)\rho}\|u^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}\|u^{(n)} - u^{(n-1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}. \tag{2.51}$$

Using a similar way, one can estimate the second term in (2.50). So, in view of (2.50) and (2.51) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^{(n+1)} - u^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant& \frac{C}{(n+1)\rho}(\|u^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} + \|u^{(n-1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}) \\ &\times \|u^{(n)} - u^{(n-1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

Repeating the procedure as in (2.52), one can obtain that for any $n > n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^{(n+1)} - u^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant& \frac{C^{n-n_0}(n_0+1)!}{\rho^{n-n_0}(n+1)!}\prod_{k=n_0}^{n-1}(\|u^{(k+1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} + \|u^{(k)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}) \\ &\times \|u^{(n_0+1)} - u^{(n_0)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

Now we show the following

Claim. $\{u^{(n)}\}_{n>n_0+1}$ is bounded in $L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}$ and $\|u^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant 2M_0$, $n > n_0 + 1$.

We prove the Claim. Taking $n = n_0 + 1$ in (2.52), we have from (2.49) that

$$\|u^{(n_0+2)} - u^{(n_0+1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant \frac{CM_0}{(n_0+2)\rho}M_0 \leqslant \frac{M_0}{2}. \tag{2.54}$$

Hence, we have $\|u^{(n_0+2)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant 2M_0$. Now let us assume the following induction assumption holds true:

$$\|u^{(m)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant 2M_0, \quad n_0+2 \leqslant m \leqslant n. \tag{2.55}$$

We show that (2.55) also holds for $m = n+1$. Applying (2.53), one has that for any $\ell = n_0+1, ..., n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^{(\ell+1)} - u^{(\ell)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant & \frac{C^{\ell-n_0}(n_0+1)!}{\rho^{\ell-n_0}(\ell+1)!} \prod_{k=n_0}^{\ell-1} (\|u^{(k+1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} + \|u^{(k)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}}) \\ & \times \|u^{(n_0+1)} - u^{(n_0)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \\ \leqslant & \frac{C^{\ell-n_0}(4M_0)^{\ell-n_0}(n_0+1)!}{\rho^{\ell-n_0}(\ell+1)!} M_0 \leqslant \frac{M_0}{2^{\ell-n_0}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^{(n+1)} - u^{(n_0+1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant & \sum_{\ell=n_0+1}^{n} \|u^{(\ell+1)} - u^{(\ell)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \\ \leqslant & \sum_{\ell=n_0+1}^{n} \frac{M_0}{2^{\ell-n_0}} \leqslant M_0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

It follows that $\|u^{(n+1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant 2M_0$.

Finally, we show that $\{u^{(n)}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Again, in view of (2.56), we have for any $n > m \gg n_0$

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^{(n+1)} - u^{(m+1)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \leqslant & \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{n} \|u^{(\ell+1)} - u^{(\ell)}\|_{L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}} \\ \leqslant & \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{n} \frac{M_0}{2^{\ell-n_0}} \leqslant \frac{M_0}{2^{m-n_0}} \to 0, \quad m \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

Therefore, $\{u^{(n)}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty_{x,t\in[0,\infty)}$. □

2.3 Some remarks on the global well-posedness

Recall that in [9, 34, 10, 5, 18, 46, 44] it was shown that:

Theorem 2.10 *Let $1 \leqslant p < \infty$, $1 \leqslant q \leqslant \infty$. Then NS is globally well-posed in $\dot{B}^{-1+d/p}_{p,q}$ for sufficiently small data. Moreover, NS is ill posed in $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,q}$, i.e., the solution map $u_0 \to u$ is discontinuous.*

However, Theorem 1.2 implies the well-posedness for a class of large data in $\dot{B}^{-1+d/p}_{p,q}$. Let φ be as in (1.23), $\widetilde{\varphi}(\xi) = \varphi(\xi)\chi_{\{1/2\leqslant\cdot\leqslant 2\}}(\xi)$[1] and

$$\widehat{u_0^1}(\xi) = c\, 2^{L(1-d)} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \widetilde{\varphi}(2^{-L}\xi_i), \quad \widehat{u_0^2} = -\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2}\widehat{u_0^1}(\xi), \quad u_0^3 = ... = u_0^n = 0, \tag{2.59}$$

[1]We denote by χ_E the characteristic function on E.

where $c \ll 1$ is a small constant. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{div} u_0 = 0$. We have,

$$\|u_0^1\|_\infty \sim 2^L, \quad \|u_0^2\|_\infty \sim 2^L. \tag{2.60}$$

It follows from Theorem 1.2 that for the initial data as in (2.59), NS is globally well-posed in L^∞. Also, we see that $\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,q}} \ll 1$ and $\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+d/p}_{p,q}} \sim 2^{dL/p}$, which is arbitrarily large in $\dot{B}^{-1+d/p}_{p,q}$.

3 Blowup profile

If we consider the profile decomposition in $\dot{H}^s$, the orthogonal condition (1.13) can be replaced by

$$\textit{either} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \left| \ln \frac{\lambda_{j_1,n}}{\lambda_{j_2,n}} \right| = \infty, \quad \textit{or} \quad \frac{\lambda_{j_1,n}}{\lambda_{j_2,n}} \equiv 1 \ \ \textit{and} \ \ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|x_{j_1,n} - x_{j_2,n}|}{\lambda_{j_1,n}} = \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

In this section we always assume that $u_0 \in H^{d/2-1}$ and $\mathrm{div}\, u_0 = 0$. Let the solution of NS blow up at $T > 0$. According to the results in [13, 14, 27, 38], we see that $\limsup_{t\to T} \|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}} = \infty$. Taking $\tau_n \nearrow T$ so that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}} = \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

For convenience, we denote for any $\lambda_{j,n} > 0,\ x_{j,n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\Lambda^\alpha_{j,n} f(x) := \frac{1}{\lambda^\alpha_{j,n}} f\left(\frac{x - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right), \quad \Lambda_{j,n} f = \Lambda^1_{j,n} f(x). \tag{3.3}$$

Let us recall the profile decomposition for a bounded sequence in $\dot{H}^{d/2-1}$ (see [23]).

Theorem 3.1 *Let $u_{0,n}$ be a bounded sequence of divergence-free vector fields in $\dot{H}^{d/2-1}$. Then there exists $\{x_{j,n}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\{\lambda_{j,n}\} \subset (0,\infty)$ which are orthogonal in the sense of (3.1), and a sequence of divergence-free vector fields $\{\phi_j\} \subset \dot{H}^{d/2-1}$ such that*

$$u_{0,n}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^J \Lambda_{j,n}\phi_j(x) + \omega_n^J(x), \tag{3.4}$$

where ω_n^J is a reminder in the sense that

$$\lim_{J\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|\omega_n^J(x)\|_d = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|u_{0,n}(x)\|^2_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}} = \sum_{j=1}^J \|\phi_j\|^2_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}} + \|\omega_n^J\|^2_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}} + \epsilon_n^J, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon_n^J = 0, \ \forall\ J. \tag{3.6}$$

Using the conservation law (1.3) in L^2, we can further show that

Lemma 3.2 (Weak convergence) *Let $\{NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\}$ be the solution sequence satisfying (3.2), $v(\tau_n) = NS(u_0)(\tau_n)/\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}$. Then $v(\tau_n)$ is weakly convergent to zero in $H^{d/2-1}$, L^d.*

Proof. In view of (1.3) and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}} \to \infty$, we see that $\|v(\tau_n)\|_2 \to 0$. This implies the weak convergent limit of $\{v(\tau_n)\}$ is zero in $H^{d/2-1}$, L^d. □

Lemma 3.2 indicates that, if we consider the profile decomposition of $v(\tau_n)$, it weakly vanishes in $L^d(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $\tau_n \nearrow T$. In view of Theorem 3.1, $v(\tau_n)$ has a profile decomposition in $\dot{H}^{d/2-1}$:

$$v(\tau_n, x) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \Lambda_{j,n}\phi_j(x) + \omega_n^J(x), \tag{3.7}$$

where ω_n^J satisfies (3.5) and (3.6). Let $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $J \geqslant j_0$, one has (3.7). As $\phi_{j_0} \in \dot{H}^{d/2-1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^d(\mathbb{R}^d)$, Hölder's inequality gives

$$\|f\|_{L^p(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)} \leqslant R_0^{d(1/p-1/q)}\|f\|_{L^q(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}, \quad q \geqslant p, \tag{3.8}$$

So we can take a $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)} = \frac{1}{2}\min\{\|\phi_{j_0}\|_2,\ 1\}. \tag{3.9}$$

Since $\lim_{J\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|\omega_n^J(x)\|_d = 0$, we can choose sufficiently large $J_0, N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\|\omega_n^J(x)\|_d < \varepsilon \leqslant \frac{\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}}{100R_0^{d/2-1}}, \quad \forall J \geqslant J_0,\ n \geqslant N_0. \tag{3.10}$$

Lemma 3.3 (Vanishing $\lambda_{j,n}$) *Let $\{NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\}$ be the solution sequence satisfying (3.2), $v(\tau_n) = NS(u_0)(\tau_n)/\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}$. Let $v(\tau_n)$ has the profile decomposition as in (3.7) with $J \geqslant j_0$. Then we have*

$$\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d/2-1} \leqslant \frac{4\|u_0\|_2}{\min\{\|\phi_{j_0}\|_2,\ 1\}\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}}, \quad n \gg 1. \tag{3.11}$$

In particular, we have $\lambda_{j_0,n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Proof. We can assume that the reminder term ω_n^J satisfying (3.10). Otherwise we can choose another profile decomposition with $J \geqslant J_0$. Let us write $\varphi_{j_0} = \phi_{j_0}\chi_{\{|\cdot|\leqslant R_0\}}$. Observing that

$$\langle \Lambda_{j,n}f,\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}g\rangle = \frac{\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-1}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\int g(y)f\left(\frac{\lambda_{j_0,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}y + \frac{x_{j_0,n} - x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\right)dy. \tag{3.12}$$

Taking the inner product of (3.7) and φ_{j_0}, we have

$$\langle v(\tau_n),\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{J}\langle \Lambda_{j,n}\phi_j,\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle + \langle \omega_n^J,\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle. \tag{3.13}$$

In view of (3.12), we have

$$\langle \Lambda_{j_0,n}\phi_{j_0},\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle = \lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}\|\varphi_{j_0}\|_2^2 = \lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}^2. \tag{3.14}$$

By Hölder's inequality, (3.5) and (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \omega_n^J,\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle| &\leqslant \|\omega_n^J\|_d\|\Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\|_{d/(d-1)} \\ &\leqslant \varepsilon R_0^{d/2-1}\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Since $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in L^d, one can choose $\varphi_j \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying

$$\|\phi_j - \varphi_j\|_d < \varepsilon/J, \quad j \neq j_0, \quad j = 1, ..., J. \tag{3.16}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Lambda_{j,n}\phi_j,\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle| \leqslant& |\langle \Lambda_{j,n}(\phi_j - \varphi_j),\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle| \\ &+ |\langle \Lambda_{j,n}\varphi_j,\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle| := I + II. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

First, we estimate I. By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I \leqslant& \|\Lambda_{j,n}(\phi_j - \varphi_j)\|_d\|\Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\|_{d/(d-1)} \\ \leqslant& \|\phi_j - \varphi_j\|_d\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}R_0^{d/2-1}\|\varphi_{j_0}\|_2 \\ \leqslant& \varepsilon J^{-1}\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}R_0^{d/2-1}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Next, we estimate II and divide the proof into the following three cases.

Case 1. $\lambda_{j_0,n} = \lambda_{j,n}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}|x_{j_0,n} - x_{j,n}|/\lambda_{j,n} = \infty$. Since $\varphi_j \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and one can also approximate φ_{j_0} by a $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ function, in view of (3.12) we see that $II \to 0$ if n is sufficiently large.

Case 2. $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j,n}/\lambda_{j_0,n} = 0$. Assume that $\mathrm{supp}\varphi_j \subset B(0, R_1)$. For convenience, we denote $a_{j,n} = (x_{j_0,n} - x_{j,n})/\lambda_{j_0,n}$. We have from (3.12), Hölder's inequality and (3.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \frac{\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-1}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\left|\int \varphi_{j_0}(y)\varphi_j\left(\frac{\lambda_{j_0,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}(y + a_{j,n})\right)dy\right| \\ &\leqslant \frac{\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-1}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\|\varphi_{j_0}\|_{L^{d/(d-1)}(|\cdot + a_{j,n}|\leqslant \lambda_{j,n}R_1/\lambda_{j_0,n})}\left\|\varphi_j\left(\frac{\lambda_{j_0,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}(\cdot + a_{j,n})\right)\right\|_d \\ &\leqslant \lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}R_0^{d/2-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_{j,n}R_1}{\lambda_{j_0,n}R_0}\right)^{d/2-1}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}\|\varphi_j\|_d. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

In view of $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j,n}/\lambda_{j_0,n}=0$, we see that

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_{j,n}R_1}{\lambda_{j_0,n}R_0}\right)^{d/2-1}\|\varphi_j\|_d\leqslant\varepsilon/J,\quad j=1,...,J,\ j\neq j_0 \tag{3.20}$$

if n is sufficiently large. Hence, it follows from (3.19) and (3.20) that

$$II\leqslant\varepsilon J^{-1}\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}R_0^{d/2-1}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)},\quad n\gg 1. \tag{3.21}$$

Case 3. $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j_0,n}/\lambda_{j,n}=0$. Still assume that supp $\varphi_j\subset B(0,R_1)$ and $b_{j,n}=(x_{j,n}-x_{j_0,n})/\lambda_{j,n}$. Similarly as in Case 2, we have from (3.12), Hölder's inequality and (3.8) that

$$\begin{aligned}II&=\frac{\lambda_{j,n}^{d-1}}{\lambda_{j_0,n}}\left|\int\varphi_j(y)\varphi_{j_0}\left(\frac{\lambda_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j_0,n}}(y+b_{j,n})\right)dy\right|\\&\leqslant\frac{\lambda_{j,n}^{d-1}}{\lambda_{j_0,n}}\|\varphi_j\|_{L^d(|\cdot+b_{j,n}|\leqslant\lambda_{j_0,n}R_0/\lambda_{j,n})}\left\|\varphi_{j_0}\left(\frac{\lambda_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j_0,n}}(\cdot+b_{j,n})\right)\right\|_{L^{d/(d-1)}}\\&\leqslant\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}R_0^{d/2-1}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}\|\varphi_j\|_{L^d(|\cdot+b_{j,n}|\leqslant\lambda_{j_0,n}R_0/\lambda_{j,n})}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Noticing that for any $j=1,...,J$ and $j\neq j_0$, $\varphi_j\in L^d(\mathbb{R}^d)$, in view of the absolute continuity of the integration, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j_0,n}/\lambda_{j,n}=0$ implies that

$$\|\varphi_j\|_{L^d(|\cdot+b_{j,n}|\leqslant\lambda_{j_0,n}R_0/\lambda_{j,n})}\leqslant\varepsilon/J \tag{3.23}$$

if n is sufficiently large. Hence, it follows from (3.22) and (3.23) that for $1\leqslant j\leqslant J$, $j\neq j_0$,

$$II\leqslant\varepsilon J^{-1}\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}R_0^{d/2-1}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)},\quad n\gg 1. \tag{3.24}$$

Collecting (3.17), (3.18), (3.21) and (3.24), one has that,

$$\sum_{j\neq j_0}|\langle\Lambda_{j,n}\phi_j,\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle|\leqslant 2\varepsilon\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}R_0^{d/2-1}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)},\quad n\gg 1. \tag{3.25}$$

Now, using (3.13)–(3.15) and (3.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle v(\tau_n),\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle|&\geqslant\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}\left(\|\varphi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}^2-3\varepsilon R_0^{d/2-1}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}\right)\\&\geqslant\frac{1}{2}\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Using the conservation (1.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_0\|_2\|\Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\|_2&\geqslant\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_2\|\Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\|_2\\&\geqslant\frac{1}{2}\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d-2}\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot H^{d/2-1}}\|\phi_{j_0}\|_{L^2(|\cdot|\leqslant R_0)}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Hence,

$$\lambda_{j_0,n}^{d/2-1}\leqslant\frac{4\|u_0\|_2}{\min\{\|\phi_{j_0}\|_2,\ 1\}\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot H^{d/2-1}}},\quad n\gg 1. \tag{3.28}$$

Since $\lim_{n\to\infty}\|u(\tau_n)\|_{\dot H^{d/2-1}}=\infty$, we easily see that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j_0,n}=0$. □

Lemma 3.4 (Blowup profile) *Let $\{NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\}$ be as in Lemma 3.3. There exist $\{\alpha_n\}$, $\{\lambda_j(\tau_n)\}$, $\{\phi_j\}$ and $\{x_j(\tau_n)\}$ with $\alpha_n \to +\infty$, $\lambda_j(\tau_n) \to 0$, $\phi_j \in \dot{H}^{d/2-1}$ and $x_j(\tau_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $u(\tau_n)$ can be decomposed in the following way:*

$$NS(u_0)(\tau_n) = \alpha_n \left(\sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_j(\tau_n)} \phi_j \left(\frac{x - x_j(\tau_n)}{\lambda_j(\tau_n)} \right) + \omega_n^J \right). \tag{3.29}$$

where ω_n^J satisfies $\lim_{J\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \|\omega_n^J\|_d = 0$ and moreover, $\alpha_n \sim \|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}$, $\lambda_j(\tau_n) \lesssim \|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}^{-2/(d-2)}$ and

$$\sup_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d} \|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{L^p(|\cdot-\xi|\lesssim\lambda_j(\tau_n))} \gtrsim \lambda_j(\tau_n)^{d/p-1} \|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}. \tag{3.30}$$

Proof. Let us observe that

$$|\langle v(\tau_n),\ \Lambda_{j_0,n}\varphi_{j_0}\rangle| \leqslant \|v(\tau_n)\|_{L^2(|\cdot-x_{j_0,n}|\leqslant R_0\lambda_{j_0,n})} \lambda_{j_0,n}^{d/2-1} \|\varphi_{j_0}\|_2, \tag{3.31}$$

we have from (3.26) that

$$\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{L^2(|\cdot-x_{j_0,n}|\leqslant R_0\lambda_{j_0,n})} \geqslant \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{j_0,n}^{d/2-1} \|\varphi_{j_0}\|_2 \|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}. \tag{3.32}$$

Again, in view of (3.8), one has that for any $2 \leqslant p \leqslant \infty$,

$$\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{L^2(|\cdot-x_{j_0,n}|\leqslant R_0\lambda_{j_0,n})} \leqslant (R_0\lambda_{j_0,n})^{d/2-d/p} \|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{L^p(|\cdot-x_{j_0,n}|\leqslant R_0\lambda_{j_0,n})}. \tag{3.33}$$

Combining (3.32) and (3.33),

$$\|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{L^p(|\cdot-x_{j_0,n}|\leqslant R_0\lambda_{j_0,n})} \geqslant \frac{1}{4} R_0^{d/p-d/2} \lambda_{j_0,n}^{d/p-1} \|\varphi_{j_0}\|_2 \|NS(u_0)(\tau_n)\|_{\dot{H}^{d/2-1}}. \tag{3.34}$$

Taking $x_{j,n} = x_j(\tau_n)$, $\lambda_j(\tau_n) = \lambda_{j,n}$, we see that the result follows from the profile decomposition in Theorem 3.1. □

4 Profile decomposition in L^p

First, let us recall the following theorem concerning the profile decomposition of bounded sequence in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Theorem 4.1 ([30]) *Let $2 \leqslant p < q, r \leqslant \infty$, $s_{r,p} := d(1/r - 1/p)$. Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a bounded sequence in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$,there exists a sequence of profiles $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and orthogonal sequences of scales and cores $\{(\lambda_{j,n}, x_{j,n})\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ $(j \in \mathbb{N})$, such that up to an extraction in n,*

$$f_n = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p} \phi_j + \psi_n^J \tag{4.1}$$

and the following properties hold:

(i) *The remainder term ψ_n^J satisfies the smallness condition:*

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\big(\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|\psi_n^J\|_{\dot B^{s_{r,p},p}_{r,q}}\big)=0. \tag{4.2}$$

(ii) *The profiles satisfy the following inequality:*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\|\phi_j\|_p^p\lesssim\liminf_{n\to\infty}\|f_n\|_p^p \tag{4.3}$$

and for each integer J,

$$\|\psi_n^J\|_p\lesssim\|f_n\|_p+\circ(1)\quad as\quad n\to\infty\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Using the diagonal method, we can assume that, up to an extraction, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j,n}$ exists for all $j\in\mathbb{N}$ (whose limit can be $+\infty$). We further denote

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{J}_1=\{j\in\mathbb{N}:\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j,n}\neq 0,\infty\},\quad \mathbb{J}_1(J)=\mathbb{J}_1\cap\{j\leqslant J\},\\
&\mathbb{J}_0(J)=\{j\in\mathbb{N}:\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j,n}=0,\ j\leqslant J\},\\
&\mathbb{J}_\infty(J)=\{j\in\mathbb{N}:\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j,n}=\infty,\ j\leqslant J\},\\
&\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)=\mathbb{J}_0(J)\cup\mathbb{J}_\infty(J).
\end{aligned}$$

For $j\in\mathbb{J}_1$, we will simply call $\lambda_{j,n}$ constant scale. Now f_n can be rewritten as

$$f_n=\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_j+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_j+\psi_n^J.$$

Denote

$$g_\eta(x):=g(x)\chi_{\{\frac{1}{\eta}\leqslant|g(x)|\leqslant\eta\}},\quad g_{\eta^c}(x):=g(x)-g_\eta(x).$$

Next, we show that, if the scales $\lambda_{j,n}$ are very small or very large, then the corresponding profiles $\Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_j$ are very small in appropriate function spaces.

Proposition 4.2 *Let $p,q,r,s_{r,p}$ are as in Theorem* 4.1*, then*

(1) $\lim_{n\to\infty}\Big\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_0(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_{j,\eta}\Big\|_{p_1}=0\quad$ *for any* $p_1<p$ *and fixed* $J,\eta\geqslant 1$ *.*

(2) $\lim_{n\to\infty}\Big\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_\infty(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_{j,\eta}\Big\|_{p_2}=0\quad$ *for any* $p_2>p$ *and fixed* $J,\eta\geqslant 1$ *.*

(3) $\lim_{J\to\infty}\lim_{\eta\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\Big\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_{j,\eta^c}+\psi_n^J\Big\|_{\dot B^{s_{r,p},p}_{r,q}}=0$ *.*

Proof. First, we prove (1). Let $p > p_1$, J, η fixed, then

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_0(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_{j,\eta}\Big\|_{p_1} &\leqslant \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_0(J)} \lambda_{j,n}^{d(\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p})}\|\phi_{j,\eta}\|_{p_1} \\ &\leqslant \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_0(J)} \lambda_{j,n}^{d(\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p})}\eta^{\frac{p}{p_1}-1}\|\phi_j\|_p^{\frac{p}{p_1}} \longrightarrow 0 \qquad as \quad n\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

The proof of (2) is similar to (1), and the details of the proof are omitted.

Finaly, we prove (3). By the assumptions on p, q, r and Proposition A.1, we can easily see $L^p \hookrightarrow \dot{B}^{s_{r,p}}_{r,q}$, thus

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_{j,\eta^c} + \psi_n^J\Big\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{r,p}}_{r,q}} &\lesssim \Big\| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{d/p}\phi_{j,\eta^c}\Big\|_p + \|\psi_n^J\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{r,p}}_{r,q}} \\ &\leqslant \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \|\phi_{j,\eta^c}\|_p + \|\psi_n^J\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{r,p}}_{r,q}}\end{aligned}$$

By the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem and the definition of ϕ_{j,η^c}, we see that

$$\lim_{\eta\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \|\phi_{j,\eta^c}\|_p = 0.$$

So, we have the result, as desired. □

Now, let us denote

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_{j,n} = \lambda_j, \quad \Lambda_j\phi_j = \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{3/p}}\phi_j\left(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda_j}\right), \quad j\in\mathbb{J}_1. \tag{4.5}$$

Proposition 4.2 indicates that the scales with indices in $\mathbb{J}_0\cup\mathbb{J}_\infty$ may not take the major roles to the Navier-Stokes evolution, as they can be considered to be the error term in some function spaces. In fact, we have the following

Theorem 4.3 (NS evolution of the bounded L^p initial data) *Fix $3 < p < \infty$, let $(u_{0,n})_{n\geqslant 1}$ be a bounded sequence of divergence-free vector fields in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$, whose profile decomposition is given in the following form as in Theorem 4.1:*

$$u_{0,n}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j(x) + \psi_n^J(x)\,.$$

We have the following conclusions.

(i) *The existence time of the Navier-Stokes solution associated with initial data $u_{0,n}$ satisfies*

$$\liminf_{n\geqslant 1} T(u_{0,n}) \geqslant \widetilde{T} := \inf_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1} T(\Lambda_j\phi_j) \tag{4.6}$$

and $T(u_{0,n}) = \infty$ if $\mathbb{J}_1$ is empty.

(ii) *There exists a* $J_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $N(J) \in \mathbb{N}$*, up to an extraction on* n*, such that*

$$NS(u_{0,n}) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j) + e^{t\Delta}\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j(x) + \psi_n^J(x)\Big) + R_n^J \tag{4.7}$$

is well-defined for $J > J_0$*,* $n > N(J)$ *and* $t < \widetilde{T}$*, moreover, for any* $T < \widetilde{T}$*,*

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|R_n^J\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} = 0, \quad \mathfrak{X}_T^p := C([0,T], L_x^p) \cap L^{\frac{5p}{3}}((0,T); L_x^{\frac{5p}{3}}). \tag{4.8}$$

(iii) *The solution satisfies the orthogonality in the sense*

$$\|NS(u_{0,n})(t)\|_p^p = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(t)\|_p^p + \|e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j + \psi_n^J\big)\|_p^p + \gamma_n^J(t) \tag{4.9}$$

with $\lim\limits_{J\to\infty}\limsup\limits_{n\to\infty} |\gamma_n^J(t)| = 0$ *for each time* $0 < t < \widetilde{T}$*.*

Remark 4.4 $\widetilde{T}$ *is attainable, provided* $\mathbb{J}_1$ *is nonempty, i.e. there exists some* $j_0 \in \mathbb{J}_1$ *such that* $\widetilde{T} = T(\Lambda_{j_0}\phi_{j_0})$*. In fact, this is a simple consequence of* (1.9) *and* (4.3)*.*

Remark 4.5 *By* (4.3)*, we know* $\lim\limits_{j\to\infty} \|\phi_j\|_p = 0$*, so for any fixed* $T < \widetilde{T}$*, there exists an index* $J_c = J_c(T)$*, such that* $T\,\|\phi_j\|_p^{\sigma_p} < c_0$*,* $j \geqslant J_c$*, where* c_0 *is given in* (1.9) *of Theorem 1.1 is sufficiently small, then by the fixed point argument in proving Theorem 1.1, we see that* $\|NS(\phi_j)\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} \leqslant 2C\|\phi_j\|_p$*,* $j \geqslant J_c$*. For the details one can refer to Appendix A.*

The proof of Theorem 4.3 will be given in Sections 6 and Section 7.

5 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Denote

$$D_c = \{NS(u_0) : T(u_0) < \infty, \quad \limsup_{t\to T(u_0)} (T(u_0) - t)\|NS(u_0)(t)\|_{L_x^p}^{\sigma_p} = M_c^{\sigma_p}\}.$$

In this Section, we will prove Theorem 1.5 by using Theorem 4.3, whose proof are separated into two steps. First, we show that there is a minimal solution $NS(u_0) \in D_c$. Secondly, using the smoothing effect of the bilinear term of the Navier-Stokes equation, we finally construct a new solution which belongs to both L^p and $\dot{B}_{p/2,\infty}^{-1+6/p}$. The proof follows the same ideas as in Poulon [37].

5.1 Existence of minimal solution in subcritical L^p

Proposition 5.1 *Let* $M_c^{\sigma_p} < \infty$*. Then* D_c *is nonempty.*

Proof. By the definition of $M_c^{\sigma_p}$, there exists a sequence of $(u_{0,n})_{n\geqslant 1}$, such that $T(u_{0,n}) < \infty$ and

$$\limsup_{t\to T(u_{0,n})} (T(u_{0,n})-t)\|NS(u_{0,n})\|_p^{\sigma_p} < M_c^{\sigma_p} + \frac{1}{2n}. \tag{5.1}$$

Further, one can find a time sequence $t_n\,(T(u_{0,n})-t_n \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} 0)$ verifying

$$(T(u_{0,n})-t)\|NS(u_{0,n})\|_p^{\sigma_p} < M_c^{\sigma_p} + 1/n \quad \text{for all} \quad t\geqslant t_n. \tag{5.2}$$

For simplicity, we write $\mu_n = T(u_{0,n}) - t_n$ and define a rescaled initial data $v_{0,n}$

$$v_{0,n} = \mu_n^{\frac{1}{2}} NS(u_{0,n})(t_n, \mu_n^{\frac{1}{2}} x).$$

Obviously from (5.2), $\|v_{0,n}\|_p^{\sigma_p} = \mu_n\|NS(u_{0,n})(t_n)\|_p^{\sigma_p} < M_c^{\sigma_p} + 1/n$, by uniqueness, the associated solution of NS is

$$NS(v_{0,n})(\tau,x) = \mu_n^{\frac{1}{2}} NS(u_{0,n})(t_n+\mu_n\tau, \mu_n^{\frac{1}{2}} x)$$

which are all defined on time interval $[0,1)$. Again, it follows from (5.2) that

$$(1-\tau)\|NS(v_{0,n})(\tau)\|_p^{\sigma_p} \leqslant M_c^{\sigma_p} + 1/n. \tag{5.3}$$

Then the desired result is a direct consequence of the following Lemma 5.2.

Lemma 5.2 *Let $(\epsilon_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ be a decreasing and vanishing sequence, $(v_{0,n})_{n\geqslant 1}$ is a bounded sequence in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and satisfies*

$$T(v_{0,n}) = 1, \qquad \sup_{0<\tau<1} (1-\tau)\|NS(v_{0,n})(\tau)\|_p^{\sigma_p} \leqslant M_c^{\sigma_p} + \epsilon_n \tag{5.4}$$

Then the following conclusions hold (passing to a subsequence if necessary)

- *In the profile decomposition of $v_{0,n}$, there exists a unique scale profile $\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0}$ such that $NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})$ blows up at time 1.*
- *$NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0}) \in D_c$ and*

$$\sup_{0<\tau<1} (1-\tau)\|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p^{\sigma_p} = \limsup_{\tau\to 1}(1-\tau)\|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p^{\sigma_p} = M_c^{\sigma_p}. \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. Assume the profile decomposition of $(v_{0,n})$ has the following form

$$v_{0,n}(x) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j + \psi_n^J. \tag{5.6}$$

Recall that $\widetilde{T} = \inf_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1} T(\Lambda_j\phi_j)$, by Remark 4.4, we assume $\widetilde{T} = T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})$ and divide the proof into three steps:

(i) We show that $\widetilde{T} = T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0}) = 1$. In view of (4.6) in Theorem 4.3, one has that $\widetilde{T} \leqslant 1$. Assume $\widetilde{T} < 1$, for any $\tau < \widetilde{T}$, by (4.9),

$$\|NS(v_{0,n})(\tau)\|_p^p \geqslant \|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p^p - |\gamma_n^J(\tau)|.$$

Multiplying $(T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})-\tau)^{\frac{p}{\sigma_p}}$ on both sides, and using the assumption (5.4), one has that

$$\frac{(T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})-\tau)^{\frac{p}{\sigma_p}}}{(1-\tau)^{\frac{p}{\sigma_p}}}(M_c^{\sigma_p}+\epsilon_n)^{\frac{p}{\sigma_p}} \geqslant \left\{(T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})-\tau)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p\right\}^p - |\gamma_n^J(\tau)|. \tag{5.7}$$

Taking limit with regard to n and J on both sides, we have

$$\frac{(T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})-\tau)^{\frac{p}{\sigma_p}}}{(1-\tau)^{\frac{p}{\sigma_p}}}M_c^p \geqslant \left\{(T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})-\tau)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p\right\}^p. \tag{5.8}$$

Noting that $\tau < \widetilde{T} = T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})$, so we have

$$\frac{(\widetilde{T}-\tau)^{\frac{p}{\sigma_p}}}{(1-\widetilde{T})^{\frac{p}{\sigma_p}}}M_c^p \geqslant \left\{(T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})-\tau)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p\right\}^p.$$

The left hand side of (5.8) can be arbitrarily small if we take τ sufficently close to $\widetilde{T}$, however, the right hand side of (5.8) has a lower bound as in Theorem 1.1, which leads to a contradiction. Hence $\widetilde{T} = T(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0}) = 1$.

(ii) We prove that $NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0}) \in D_c$. It follows from the definition of $M_c^{\sigma_p}$ and (5.8) that

$$\limsup_{\tau\to 1}(1-\tau)\|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p^{\sigma_p} = \sup_{0<\tau<1}(1-\tau)\|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p^{\sigma_p} = M_c^{\sigma_p}.$$

(iii) Profile with constant scale blowing up at time 1 is unique. We also prove it by contradiction. Assume there is another constant scale profile $\Lambda_{j_0}\phi_{j_0}$ which blows up at time 1. Using (4.9) again, we find

$$\|NS(v_{0,n})(\tau)\|_p^p \geqslant \|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p^p + \|NS(\Lambda_{j_0}\phi_{j_0})(\tau)\|_p^p - |\gamma_n^J(\tau)|.$$

Repeating the the argument in (i), we can deduce that

$$M_c^p \geqslant \left\{(1-\tau)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0})(\tau)\|_p\right\}^p + \left\{(1-\tau)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|NS(\Lambda_{j_0}\phi_{j_0})(\tau)\|_p\right\}^p.$$

Due to $NS(\Lambda_{k_0}\phi_{k_0}) \in D_c$, we must have $NS(\Lambda_{j_0}\phi_{j_0}) = 0$, so $\phi_{j_0} = 0$. The proof of Lemma 5.2 is finished. □

5.2 Existence of solutions in $D_c \cap \dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}$

In general, we could not expect that the linear term $e^{t\Delta}u_0$ belongs to $\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}$, provided we only assume the initial data $u_0 \in L^p$. To get the desired result, we need to use the regularization effect of the biliner term $\mathscr{B}(u,u)$. In fact, based on our assumption, the following proposition holds.

Proposition 5.3 *Let u_0 be in L^p, where $3 < p < \infty$, the associated Navier-Stokes solution $u(t) := NS(u_0)(t)$ satisfies a minimal blow up condition, i.e.*

$$T(u_0) < \infty, \quad M^{\sigma_p} := \sup_{0<t<T(u_0)} (T(u_0)-t)\|NS(u_0)(t)\|_p^{\sigma_p} < \infty, \quad \sigma_p = \frac{2}{1-3/p}$$

then we have

$$\sup_{0<t<T(u_0)} \|\mathscr{B}(u,u)(t)\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}} < \infty \tag{5.9}$$

Furthermore, if $0 < s < 1-3/p$, then

$$\sup_{0<t<T(u_0)} (T(u_0)-t)^{\frac{1}{2}(s+1-3/p)} \|\mathscr{B}(u,u)(t)\|_{\dot{B}^{s}_{p,\infty}} < \infty \tag{5.10}$$

Proof. First, we prove (5.9). It follows from (2.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\triangle_j \mathscr{B}(u,u)\|_{L^{p/2}} &\lesssim \int_0^t 2^j e^{-c(t-s)2^{2j}} \|\triangle_j (u\otimes u)\|_{L^{p/2}}\, ds \\ &\lesssim \int_0^t 2^j e^{-c(t-s)2^{2j}} \|u(s)\|_p^2\, ds \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Since $u(t)$ is a blowup solution of type-I,

$$\|u(t)\|_p^2 \leqslant \frac{M^2}{(T(u_0)-t)^{1-3/p}}$$

Hence

$$2^{j(-1+\frac{6}{p})}\|\triangle_j \mathscr{B}(u,u)\|_{L^{p/2}} \lesssim \int_0^t 2^{j\frac{6}{p}} e^{-c(t-s)2^{2j}} \frac{M^2}{(T(u_0)-s)^{1-3/p}}\, ds. \tag{5.12}$$

Let us observe that

$$2^{j\frac{6}{p}} \int_0^t \chi_{\{T(u_0)-s\leqslant 2^{-2j}\}} e^{-c(t-s)2^{2j}} \frac{M^2}{(T(u_0)-s)^{1-3/p}}\, ds \lesssim M^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \chi_{\{T(u_0)-s\geqslant 2^{-2j}\}} e^{-c(t-s)2^{2j}} \frac{M^2}{(T(u_0)-s)^{1-3/p}}\, ds \\ &\qquad \lesssim 2^{2j} M^2 \int_0^t e^{-c(t-s)2^{2j}}\, ds \lesssim M^2. \end{aligned}$$

(5.9) is obtained.

Next, we prove (5.10). We divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1. $T(u_0)-t<2^{-2j}$. By hypothesis, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(T(u_0)-t)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|\mathscr{B}(u,u)(t)\|_p &\lesssim (T(u_0)-t)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|u(t)\|_p+(T(u_0)-t)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|e^{t\Delta}u_0\|_p\\ &\leq M+T(u_0)^{\frac{1}{\sigma_p}}\|u_0\|_p<\infty.\end{aligned}$$

For $s>0$, note $\sigma_p=\frac{2}{1-3/p}$ and $2^j<(T(u_0)-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$

$$2^{js}\|\triangle_j\mathscr{B}(u,u)(t)\|_p\lesssim\frac{1}{(T(u_0)-t)^{\frac{1}{2}(s+1-3/p)}}$$

Case 2. $T(u_0)-t\geqslant 2^{-2j}$. By Bernstein's inequality and the assumption,

$$\|\triangle_j\mathscr{B}(u,u)(t)\|_p\lesssim\int_0^t 2^{j(1+3/p)}e^{-c(t-\tau)2^{2j}}\frac{M^2}{(T(u_0)-\tau)^{1-3/p}}\,\mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Multiplying it by 2^{js} and using the fact that $\tau<t$ and $s-1+3/p<0$,

$$\begin{aligned}2^{js}\|\triangle_j\mathscr{B}(u,u)(t)\|_p&\lesssim\int_0^t 2^{j(1+s+3/p)}e^{-c(t-\tau)2^{2j}}\frac{M^2}{(T(u_0)-t)^{1-3/p}}\,\mathrm{d}\tau\\ &\lesssim\frac{M^2}{(T(u_0)-t)^{1-3/p}}2^{j(s-1+3/p)}\\ &\leqslant\frac{1}{(T(u_0)-t)^{\frac{1}{2}(s+1-3/p)}}\end{aligned}$$

Combining (1) and (2), we finally obtain (5.10). □

Next we prove a lemma which allows us to exclude profiles without constant scales in the profile decomposition of a bounded sequence in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Lemma 5.4 *Let $3<p<\infty, 0<s<1-3/p$, then the following statements hold:*

(1) *Assume $(f_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is a bounded sequence in $\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}\cap L^p$, s.t. $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|f_n\|_{\dot{B}^0_{p,\infty}}>0$, then there are no scales which tend to infinity in the L^p profile decomposition of f_n.*

(2) *Assume $(f_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is a bounded sequence in $\dot{B}^s_{p,\infty}\cap L^p$, s.t. $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|f_n\|_{\dot{B}^0_{p,\infty}}>0$, then there are no scales which tend to zero in the L^p profile decomposition of f_n.*

Proof : First, we argue by contradiction to prove (1). Assume for a contrary that there exists a scale $\lambda_{k,n}\xrightarrow{n\to\infty}\infty$. By Theorem 4.1, let the profile decomposition of f_n has the following form

$$f_n=\sum_{j=1}^{J}\frac{1}{\lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}}\phi_j\big(\frac{x-x_{j,n}}{\lambda_{j,n}}\big)+\psi_n^J.$$

It follows from $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|f_n\|_{\dot{B}^0_{p,\infty}} > 0$ that $f_n \not\equiv 0$, As we know, each ϕ_j is a weak limit of some rigid tranformation of f_n, more precisely, we have

$$\lambda_{j,n}^{3/p} f_n(\lambda_{j,n}x + x_{j,n}) \rightharpoonup \phi_j$$

in the sense of tempered distribution. Without loss of generality, we assume $\phi_j \neq 0$ for each j. Observing

$$\lambda_{k,n}^{3/p}\|f_n(\lambda_{k,n}x + x_{k,n})\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}} \equiv \lambda_{k,n}^{3/p-1}\|f_n\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}} \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} 0$$

due to the hypothesis on f_n and $\lambda_{k,n} \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} \infty$. By lower semi-continuity, we get

$$\|\phi_k\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}} \leqslant \liminf_{n\to\infty} \lambda_{k,n}^{3/p}\|f_n(\lambda_{k,n}x + x_{k,n})\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}} = 0$$

so $\phi_k = 0$, this contradicts our assumption. The proof of (2) proceeds in a similar way as that of (1) and the details are omitted. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We only outline the main procedures in the proof of existence of a critical element in $\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}$, as the argument is quite similar to [37]. Indeed, we already have a minimal solution $\Psi = NS(\Psi_0) \in D_c$ from Proposition 5.1, so there exists a time sequence $t_n \to T(\Psi_0)$ and $\epsilon_n \to 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}(T(\Psi_0) - t_n)\|NS(\Psi_0)(t_n)\|_p^{\sigma_p} = M_c^{\sigma_p}$$

and

$$(T(\Psi_0) - t)\|NS(\Psi_0)(t)\|_p^{\sigma_p} \leqslant M_c^{\sigma_p} + \epsilon_n \quad \text{for any} \quad t \geqslant t_n \tag{5.13}$$

as before,we define a rescaled initial data $v_{0,n}$

$$v_{0,n}(x) = (T(\Psi_0) - t_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} NS(\Psi_0)(t_n, (T(\Psi_0) - t_n)^{\frac{1}{2}}x)$$

denote $\tau_n = T(\Psi_0) - t_n$ for short, we get

$$v_{0,n}(x) = \tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{t_n\Delta}\Psi_0(\tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}x) + \tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathscr{B}(\Psi_0, \Psi_0)(t_n, \tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}x)$$

Due to $\tau_n \to 0$, (5.13) and Proposition 5.3, we can easily get

$$\tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e^{t_n\Delta}\Psi_0(\tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}x)\|_p \to 0, \qquad n \to \infty$$
$$\rho_n := \tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathscr{B}(\Psi_0, \Psi_0)(t_n, \tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}x) \in L^p \cap \dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty} \cap \dot{B}^s_{p,\infty}$$

Next we take L^p profile decomposition of ρ_n,

$$\rho_n = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j(x) + \psi_n^J$$

then come back to $v_{0,n}$

$$v_{0,n}(x)=\sum_{j=1}^{J}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j(x)+\psi_n^J+\tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{t_n\Delta}\Psi_0(\tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}x)$$

In this circumstance, $\psi_n^J+\tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{t_n\Delta}\Psi_0(\tau_n^{\frac{1}{2}}x)$ can be considered as the remainders, and according to Lemma 5.4, in the profile decomposition of ρ_n, only profiles with constant scales are left, and each $\phi_j(x)$ is the weak limit of $\lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\rho_n(\lambda_{j,n}x+x_{j,n})$, so all these profiles lies in $L^p\cap\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}\cap\dot{B}^{s}_{p,\infty}$. Now it can be easily checked that $(v_{0,n})_{n\geqslant 1}$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 5.2, hence there exists a unique scale profile $\Lambda_{l_0}\phi_{l_0}\in L^p\cap\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}$ such that $NS(\Lambda_{l_0}\phi_{l_0})\in D_c$ and blows up at time 1. Moreover for any $0<\tau<1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0<\tau<1}\|NS(\Lambda_{l_0}\phi_{l_0})(\tau)\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}}&=\sup_{0<\tau<1}\|e^{\tau\Delta}\Lambda_{l_0}\phi_{l_0}+\mathscr{B}(\Lambda_{l_0}\phi_{l_0},\Lambda_{l_0}\phi_{l_0})(\tau)\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}}\\&\lesssim\|\phi_{l_0}\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}}+\sup_{0<\tau<1}\|\mathscr{B}(\Lambda_{l_0}\phi_{l_0},\Lambda_{l_0}\phi_{l_0})(\tau)\|_{\dot{B}^{-1+6/p}_{p/2,\infty}}<\infty\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Proposition 5.3. Therefore we finish the proof of Theorem 1.5. □

6 Proof of Theorem 4.3

This section is devoted to the proof of (i) and (ii) in Theorem 4.3. Let $(u_{0,n})_{n\geqslant 1}$ be a bounded sequence in L^p and the corresponding profile decomposition is given below

$$u_{0,n}=\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j+\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j+\psi_n^J\,,\tag{6.1}$$

we look for an approximative solution to the genuine solution $NS(u_{0,n})$, let

$$NS(u_{0,n})=U_n^{app,J}+R_n^J$$

where we denote

$$U_n^{app,J}=\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)}NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)+e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j+\psi_n^J\big)$$

obviously, $U_n^{app,J}$ is defined on $[0,\widetilde{T}_1)$, $\widetilde{T}_1:=\inf\limits_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1}T(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)$. R_n^J is a divergence free vector field, which is defined on $[0,T_n)$, $T_n:=\min\{\widetilde{T}_1,T(u_{0,n})\}$ and satisfies the perturbation equation below

$$\begin{cases}\partial_tR_n^J+R_n^J\cdot\nabla R_n^J-\Delta R_n^J+Q(R_n^J,U_n^{app,J})=-\nabla\cdot G_n^J-\nabla p_n^J\\ \operatorname{div}R_n^J=0\\ R_{n|t=0}^J=0\end{cases}\tag{6.2}$$

where $Q(a,b) := a\cdot\nabla b + b\cdot\nabla a = 2\nabla\cdot(a\otimes b)$ for any divergence free vector fields a, b and

$$\begin{aligned} G_n^J = & \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{J}_1(J):j\neq k} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\otimes NS(\Lambda_{k,n}^{3/p}\phi_k) \\ & + \quad 2\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\otimes e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j+\psi_n^J\big) \\ & + \quad e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j+\psi_n^J\big)\otimes e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j+\psi_n^J\big) \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Now (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.3 will be consequences of the following two lemmas and Proposition A.6 in the appendix. We remark that by the lower semi-continuity in Corollary A.7, for arbitrary $\varepsilon>0$, there exists a $N:=N(\varepsilon)$, such that $n>N$, $\widetilde{T}_1 := \inf_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1} T(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j) \geqslant \widetilde{T} := \inf_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1} T(\Lambda_j\phi_j)-\varepsilon$.

Lemma 6.1 *For any $0<T<\widetilde{T} := \inf\limits_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1} T(\Lambda_j\phi_j)$, there exists constant $C>0$ such that, up to an extraction to $n\in\mathbb{N}$,*

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|U_n^{app,J}\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p}\leqslant C.$$

Lemma 6.2 *Let $3<p<\infty$, $1/\beta(p)=1/2-3/10p$, T be as in Lemma 6.1. Then we have*

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|G_n^J\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}}=0.$$

Let us turn to the proof of Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2. First, we give a lemma, which will be used in the sequel.

Lemma 6.3 *Let $J\in\mathbb{N}$, $3<p<\infty$, $r=5p/3$. Let $\phi_j\in L^p$ and $(x_{j,n},\lambda_{j,n})_{n\geqslant 1}$ be orthogonal scales and cores in the sense of (1.13), then for any $T\leqslant\inf_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)}T_j$, $T_j<T(\Lambda_j\phi_j)$ is arbitrary. Then there exists $N(T,J)$ such that for any $n>N(T,J)$,*

$$\Big\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\Big\|_{L_t^r((0,T),L_x^r(\mathbb{R}^3))}^r \leqslant \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)}\big\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\big\|_{L_t^r((0,T_j),L_x^r(\mathbb{R}^3))}^r+\varepsilon(J,n), \tag{6.4}$$

where $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon(J,n)=0$. Furthermore, for any $0\leqslant t\leqslant T$, up to an extraction to $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\Big\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)(t)\Big\|_p^p = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)}\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(t,\cdot)\|_p^p+\sigma_{J,n}(t), \tag{6.5}$$

where $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\sup\limits_{0<t<T}|\sigma_{J,n}(t)|=0$.

Using Lemma 6.3, we can prove Lemma 6.1.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. By the definition of $U_n^{app,J}$,

$$\|U_n^{app,J}\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} \leqslant \|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} + \|e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j + \psi_n^J\big)\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} := I + II$$

where

$$I = \|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^p} + \|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\|_{L_T^{\frac{5p}{3}} L_x^{\frac{5p}{3}}}.$$

From (6.5) it follows that

$$\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^p}^p \leqslant \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^p}^p + \|\sigma_{J,n}(t)\|_{L_T^\infty}.$$

Taking $n\to\infty$, up to an extraction to n, one has that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^p}^p \leqslant \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^p}^p. \tag{6.6}$$

In view of Remark 4.5, we see that there exists a $J_c\in\mathbb{N}$ such that for $j\geqslant J_c$,

$$\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^p} \leqslant 2C\|\phi_j\|_p.$$

Therefore, the left hand side of (6.6) can be bounded by

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J_c)} \|NS(\phi_j)\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^p}^p + C\sum_{j=1}^\infty \|\phi_j\|_p^p \tag{6.7}$$

as indicated by (4.3), $\sum\limits_{j=1}^\infty \|\phi_j\|_p^p \lesssim \liminf\limits_{n\to\infty} \|u_{0,n}\|_p^p$ and $T<\widetilde{T}$, thus

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\|_{L_T^\infty L_x^p}^p < \infty. \tag{6.8}$$

Using the same way as above, in view of (6.4)and $l^p\hookrightarrow l^{\frac{5}{3}p}$ we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\|_{L_T^{\frac{5p}{3}} L_x^{\frac{5p}{3}}}^{\frac{5p}{3}} \lesssim \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J_c)} \|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|_{L_T^{\frac{5p}{3}} L_x^{\frac{5p}{3}}}^{\frac{5}{3}p} + \sum_{j\geqslant 1} \|\phi_j\|_p^{\frac{5p}{3}} < \infty. \tag{6.9}$$

Therefore, we get the estimate of I. Now we estimate II. By the estimate of $e^{t\Delta}$ and Theorem 4.1 we have

$$II \lesssim \|u_{0,n}\|_p + \|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j\|_p.$$

It follows from (6.5) that

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j + \psi_n^J\big)\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} \lesssim \sup_{n\geqslant 1}\|u_{0,n}\|_p < \infty. \tag{6.10}$$

Combining the estimate on I and II, we finally complete the proof of Lemma 6.1. $\square$

Next, we prove Lemma 6.3 by following the ideas in Lemma 2.6 of [17]. However, in the subcritical cases $\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}$ has no scaling invariance for the solutions of NS, i.e., $NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}u_0) \neq \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}NS(u_0)$.

Proof of Lemma 6.3. For $r = 5p/3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\Big\|_{L_T^rL_x^r}^r &= \Big\| \Big| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\Big|^r\Big\|_{L_T^1L_x^1} \\ &\leqslant \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \big\|NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\big\|_{L_T^rL_x^r}^r + \varepsilon(J,n), \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(J,n) :&= \Big\| \Big| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\Big|^r - \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \big|NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\big|^r\Big\|_{L_T^1L_x^1} \\ &\leqslant C_{J,p} \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{J}_1(J),\, j\neq k} \big\||NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)||NS(\Lambda_{k,n}^{3/p}\phi_k)|^{r-1}\big\|_{L_T^1L_x^1}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used an elementary inequality (cf.,e.g.,[23])

$$\Big| |\sum_{j=1}^L a_j|^m - \sum_{j=1}^L |a_j|^m \Big| \leqslant C_{L,m} \sum_{1\leqslant j,k\leqslant L: j\neq k} |a_j||a_k|^{m-1},\ 1 < m < \infty. \tag{6.12}$$

In order to show the result, we divide the proof into the following three steps.

Step 1. For any $j \in \mathbb{J}_1$ and $\phi_j \in L^p$, we show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j - (\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})\|_p = 0. \tag{6.13}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can choose $\varphi_j \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies

$$\|\varphi_j - \phi_j\|_p < \varepsilon.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j - (\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})\|_p \\ &\qquad\leqslant \|\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\varphi_j - (\Lambda_j\varphi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})\|_p + \|\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}(\varphi_j - \phi_j)\|_p + \|\Lambda_j(\varphi_j - \phi_j)\|_p \\ &\qquad\leqslant \|(\lambda_j/\lambda_{j,n})^{3/p}\varphi_j(\lambda_j\cdot/\lambda_{j,n}) - \varphi_j\|_p + 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

Noticing that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_j/\lambda_{j,n} = 1$, from the uniform continuity of φ_j we can obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|(\lambda_j/\lambda_{j,n})^{3/p}\varphi_j(\lambda_j\cdot/\lambda_{j,n}) - \varphi_j\|_p = 0. \tag{6.15}$$

It follows from (6.14) and (6.15) that (6.13) holds true.

Step 2. For any $j \in \mathbb{J}_1$ and $\phi_j \in L^p$, we show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j) - NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} = 0. \tag{6.16}$$

In fact, in view of the translation invariance of NS, one can regard $x_{j,n} = 0$ in (6.16). Now, let $v^n := NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j) - NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(x)$, obviously it satisfies the following perturbation equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v^n & +(v^n\cdot\nabla)v^n - \Delta v^n + (v^n\cdot\nabla)NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j) + (NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\cdot\nabla)v^n = -\nabla p,\ \operatorname{div} v^n = 0, \\ v^n_{|t=0} & = \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j - \Lambda_j\phi_j. \end{cases}$$

Applying Proposition A.6 and (6.13), we see that for sufficiently large $n > N(T)$,

$$\|v^n\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} \lesssim \|\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j - \Lambda_j\phi_j\|_p \exp(C\,T^{5p(1-3/p)/6}\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|^{5p/3}_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}) := \delta(n,T) \to 0,$$

Hence, we have (6.16) and

$$\|NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} \leqslant \|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} + \delta(n,T). \tag{6.17}$$

So, by (6.17) and (6.9),

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \big\|NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\big\|^r_{L_T^rL_x^r} \leqslant \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \big\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\big\|^r_{L_T^rL_x^r} + \rho(n,J,T), \quad \rho(n,J,T)\to 0. \tag{6.18}$$

Step 3. We show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big\||NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)||NS(\Lambda_{k,n}^{3/p}\phi_k)|^{r-1}\big\|_{L_T^1L_x^1} = 0, \quad \text{for each} \quad j\neq k,\ j,k\in\mathbb{J}_1(J). \tag{6.19}$$

By (6.16), it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big\||NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})||NS(\Lambda_k\phi_k)(\cdot - x_{k,n})|^{r-1}\big\|_{L_T^1L_x^1} = 0, \quad \text{for each} \quad j\neq k. \tag{6.20}$$

Since $C_0^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ is dense in $L_T^rL_x^r$, it suffices to show (6.20) by assuming that $NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j) \in C_0^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)$. Noticing that $|x_{j,n} - x_{k,n}| \to \infty$, we see that the left hand side of (6.20) is zero when n is sufficiently large. Hence, we have (6.19).

Now (6.4) follows from the estimates of Steps 1–3. Next, we turn to prove (6.5).

$$\Big\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)\Big\|_p^p := \Big\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})\Big\|_p^p + \alpha_1(t,J,n). \tag{6.21}$$

In view of (6.16), (6.6) and (6.7), we see that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\alpha_1(t,J,n)| = 0. \tag{6.22}$$

Let us write

$$\Big\| \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})\Big\|_p^p := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|_p^p + \alpha_2(t,J,n). \tag{6.23}$$

It is easy to see that

$$|\alpha_2(t,J,n)| \leqslant C_{J,p} \sum_{j\neq k,\ j,k\leqslant \mathbb{J}_1(J)} \int |NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})||NS(\Lambda_k\phi_k)(\cdot - x_{k,n})|^{p-1}dx. \tag{6.24}$$

Define

$$h_n(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n})||NS(\Lambda_k\phi_k)(\cdot - x_{k,n})|^{p-1}dx.$$

The desired conclusion follows if we obtain that (up to a subsequence for $n\in\mathbb{N}$)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{0<t<T} |h_n(t)| = 0 \quad \text{for } j\neq k. \tag{6.25}$$

Using the fact $NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\in C([0,T],L^p)$, we can show that $h_n(t)$ is uniformly bounded and equi-continuous. In addition, due to the orthogonality of cores, it can be easily checked that $\lim_{n\to\infty} h_n(t) = 0$, for each $t\in[0,T]$. Now we apply the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem, there exists subsequence $(n_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ such that $\lim_{n_k\to\infty} \sup_{0<t<T} h_{n_k}(t) = 0$. Lemma 6.3 is proved. □

Now let us turn our attention to the proof of Lemma 6.2, which shows the smallness of the forcing term. First we present the main inequalities that will be used, whose proof relies heavily on the space-time estimate of heat kernel.

Proposition 6.4 *Let $3<p<\infty$, $1/\beta(p) = 1/2 - 3/10p$.*

(i) *Let $1/m = 1/p - \epsilon$, $0<\epsilon\leqslant 2/5p$. We have*

$$\|ve^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}} \leqslant CT^{(1-3/m)/2}\|u_0\|_{L_x^m}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}.$$

(ii) *Let $1/r = 1/p + \varepsilon$, $0<\varepsilon<\min\{1/3 - 1/p, 4/5p\}$. We have*

$$\|ve^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}} \leqslant CT^{(1-3/r)/2}\|u_0\|_{L_x^r}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}.$$

(iii) *Let $\sigma(p) = 4p/3$, $s_{\sigma(p),p} = 3(1/\sigma(p) - 1/p)$. We have*

$$\|ve^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}} \leqslant CT^{(1-3/p)/2}\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{\sigma(p),p}}_{\sigma(p),\sigma(p)}}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}.$$

Proof. First, we prove (i). Let $\nu(p)$ satisfy $3/m = 9/5p + 2/\nu(p)$. It is easy to see that $p<m\leqslant\min\{\nu(p),5p/3\}$. Applying Hölder's inequality, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}\|ve^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}} &\leqslant T^{(1-\frac{3}{m})/2}\|e^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\nu(p)}L_x^{5p/3}}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}\\ &\lesssim T^{(1-\frac{3}{m})/2}\|u_0\|_{L_x^m}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (A.3).

Next, we show (ii). Let $\rho(p)$ satisfy $2/\rho(p)+9/5p = 3/r$. It follows from the hypothesis that $3 < r < 5p/3, \rho(p)$. Using the same way as in the proof of (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|ve^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}} &\leqslant T^{(1-\frac{3}{r})/2}\|e^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\rho(p)}L_x^{5p/3}}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}\\ &\lesssim T^{(1-\frac{3}{r})/2}\|u_0\|_{L_x^r}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove (iii). Let $\eta(p) = 3(1/\sigma(p) - 3/5p)$, $2/\kappa(p) + 9/5p = 3/p$. Obviously, $\eta(p) > 0, \kappa(p) > \sigma(p)$. By Proposition A.1, we see that $\dot{B}^{\eta(p)}_{\sigma(p),\sigma(p)} \hookrightarrow L^{5p/3}$. So, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|ve^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}} &\lesssim \big\|\|v(t)\|_{L_x^{5p/3}}\|e^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{\dot{B}^{\eta(p)}_{\sigma(p),\sigma(p)}}\big\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}}\\ &\leqslant T^{(1-3/p)/2}\|e^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{L_T^{\kappa(p)}\dot{B}^{\eta(p)}_{\sigma(p),\sigma(p)}}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, applying the result of (A.8), we can bound the above term by

$$CT^{(1-3/p)/2}\|u_0\|_{\dot{B}^{\eta(p)-\frac{2}{\kappa(p)}}_{\sigma(p),\sigma(p)}}\|v\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}.$$

A simple calculation shows $\eta(p)-\frac{2}{\kappa(p)} = 3(\frac{1}{\sigma(p)}-\frac{1}{p}) = s_{\sigma(p),p}$. Hence we obtain the desired result. □

Proof of Lemma 6.2: we rewrite G_n^J so as to make use of the smallness of profiles without constant scales. We make a cut-off on ϕ_j and denote

$$\begin{aligned}U^0_{n,\eta} &:= \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_0(J)}\Lambda^{3/p}_{j,n}\phi_{j,\eta},\quad U^\infty_{n,\eta} := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_\infty(J)}\Lambda^{3/p}_{j,n}\phi_{j,\eta}\\ \psi^J_{n,\eta} &:= \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda^{3/p}_{j,n}\phi_{j,\eta^c} + \psi^J_n.\end{aligned}\tag{6.26}$$

Obviously

$$U_n^{app,J} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda^{3/p}_{j,n}\phi_j) + e^{t\Delta}(U^0_{n,\eta} + U^\infty_{n,\eta} + \psi^J_{n,\eta}).$$

It follows that

$$G_n^J = G^{J,1}_{n,\eta} + G^{J,2}_{n,\eta} + G^{J,3}_{n,\eta} + G^{J,4}_n,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}G^{J,1}_{n,\eta} &= \big(2\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda^{3/p}_{j,n}\phi_j) + e^{t\Delta}(U^0_{n,\eta} + U^\infty_{n,\eta} + \psi^J_{n,\eta})\big)\otimes e^{t\Delta}U^0_{n,\eta}\\ G^{J,2}_{n,\eta} &= \big(2\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda^{3/p}_{j,n}\phi_j) + e^{t\Delta}(U^0_{n,\eta} + U^\infty_{n,\eta} + \psi^J_{n,\eta})\big)\otimes e^{t\Delta}U^\infty_{n,\eta}\\ G^{J,3}_{n,\eta} &= \big(2\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda^{3/p}_{j,n}\phi_j) + e^{t\Delta}(U^0_{n,\eta} + U^\infty_{n,\eta} + \psi^J_{n,\eta})\big)\otimes e^{t\Delta}\psi^J_{n,\eta}\\ G^{J,4}_n &= \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{J}_1:j\neq k} NS(\Lambda^{3/p}_{j,n}\phi_j)\otimes NS(\Lambda^{3/p}_{k,n}\phi_k)\end{aligned}$$

First, we consider the estimate of $G_{n,\eta}^{J,1}$. Let r be as in (ii) of Proposition 6.4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_{n,\eta}^{J,1}\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}} \leqslant & CT^{(1-3/r)/2}\|U_{n,\eta}^0\|_{L_x^r}\times \\ & \|2\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)+e^{t\Delta}(U_{n,\eta}^0+U_{n,\eta}^\infty+\psi_{n,\eta}^J)\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}.\end{aligned}$$

As a result of (6.9) and (6.10), one has that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{J\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|2\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} & NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)+e^{t\Delta}(U_{n,\eta}^0+U_{n,\eta}^\infty+\psi_{n,\eta}^J)\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\, j\leqslant J_c}\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|_{L_T^{\frac{5p}{3}}L_x^{\frac{5p}{3}}}+\sup_{n\geqslant 1}\|u_{0,n}\|_p<\infty.\end{aligned}$$

In addition, $r<p$, by (1) of Proposition 4.2,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|U_{n,\eta}^0\|_{L_x^r}=0$$

Therefore, we attain

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|G_{n,\eta}^{J,1}\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}}=0.$$

Next, using (i) of Proposition 6.4 and (2) of Proposition 4.2, the estimate of $G_{n,\eta}^{J,2}$ is quite similar to $G_{n,\eta}^{J,1}$ and we omit the details.

Thirdly, we estimate of $G_{n,\eta}^{J,3}$. Let $\sigma(p), s_{\sigma(p),p}$ be as in Proposition 6.4 (iii), so the following inequality holds,

$$\begin{aligned}\|G_{n,\eta}^{J,3}\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}} \leqslant & CT^{1/2(1-3/p)}\|\psi_{n,\eta}^J\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{\sigma(p),p}}_{\sigma(p),\sigma(p)}} \\ & \times\|2\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j)+e^{t\Delta}(U_{n,\eta}^0+U_{n,\eta}^\infty+\psi_{n,\eta}^J)\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}.\end{aligned}$$

Fix $q=r=\sigma(p)>p, s_{r,p}=s_{\sigma(p),p}$ in Theorem 4.1, then it follows from Proposition 4.2 (3) that

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\lim_{\eta\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\|\psi_{n,\eta}^J\right\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{\sigma(p),p}}_{\sigma(p),\sigma(p)}}=0$$

so we acquire

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\lim_{\eta\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|G_{n,\eta}^{J,3}\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)}L_x^{5p/6}}=0$$

Finally, the smallness of $G_n^{J,4}$ has been given as in Lemma 6.3. Combining the estimate on $G_{n,\eta}^{J,1},\ G_{n,\eta}^{J,2},\ G_{n,\eta}^{J,3}$ and $G_n^{J,4}$, we complete the proof of Lemma 6.2. □

7 Orthogonality of the profiles of L^p-solutions

This section is intended to prove the orthogonality property of the Navier-Stokes solutions, i.e. formula (4.9) in Theorem 4.3. Let us introduce some simplified notations first, define

$$A_n^J := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j), \quad \bar{A}_n^J = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(\cdot - x_{j,n}),$$
$$B_n^J := e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j + \psi_n^J\big) = e^{t\Delta}(U_{n,\eta}^0 + U_{n,\eta}^\infty + \psi_{n,\eta}^J),$$

where $U_{n,\eta}^0, U_{n,\eta}^\infty, \psi_{n,\eta}^J$ are defined as (6.26). Recall that we have

$$NS(u_{0,n}) = A_n^J + B_n^J + R_n^J.$$

Proof of (4.9). Let $0 < t < \widetilde{T}$ be fixed, using inequality (6.12) again and the above expression of $NS(u_{0,n})$, we easily find

$$\begin{aligned}
|\gamma_n^J(t)| &= \big|\|NS(u_{0,n})(t)\|_p^p - \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)(t)\|_p^p - \|e^{t\Delta}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)} \Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_j + \psi_n^J\big)\|_p^p\big| \\
&\leqslant C_p\Big(\big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |A_n^J|^p dx - \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\big|^p dx\big| \\
&\qquad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |R_n^J|^p dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |B_n^J|^{p-1}|R_n^J| + |B_n^J|\cdot|R_n^J|^{p-1} dx \\
&\qquad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |A_n^J|^{p-1}|R_n^J| + |A_n^J|\cdot|R_n^J|^{p-1} dx \\
&\qquad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |A_n^J|^{p-1}|B_n^J| + |A_n^J|\cdot|B_n^J|^{p-1} dx\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

it follows from (6.5) and (4.8) that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |A_n^J|^p dx - \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\big|^p dx\big| = 0$$
$$\lim_{J\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |R_n^J|^p dx = 0$$

Concerning the terms $|B_n^J|^{p-1}|R_n^J|$ and $|B_n^J|\cdot|R_n^J|^{p-1}$, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|B_n^J|^{p-1}|R_n^J| + |B_n^J|\cdot|R_n^J|^{p-1}) dx \leqslant \|B_n^J\|_p^{p-1}\|R_n^J\|_p + \|B_n^J\|_p\|R_n^J\|_p^{p-1}.$$

By (6.10) and the estimate on R_n^J, one has that

$$\lim_{J\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|B_n^J|^{p-1}|R_n^J| + |B_n^J|\cdot|R_n^J|^{p-1}) dx = 0.$$

We can deal with the terms $|A_n^J|^{p-1}|R_n^J|$ and $|A_n^J|\cdot|R_n^J|^{p-1}$ similarly. Thus we are only left with terms $|A_n^J|^{p-1}|B_n^J|$ and $|A_n^J|\cdot|B_n^J|^{p-1}$. Moreover, in view of Lemma 6.3, it suffices to show that

Proposition 7.1 *Let $\bar{A}_n^J, B_n^J$ be as above, $0 < t < \widetilde{T}$ be fixed, then it holds*

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|B_n^J| + |\bar{A}_n^J|\cdot|B_n^J|^{p-1})dx = 0$$

Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, as we know

$$B_n^J = e^{t\Delta}(U_{n,\eta}^0 + U_{n,\eta}^\infty + \psi_{n,\eta}^J)$$

Concerning $|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|B_n^J|$, it suffices to verify the smallness of $|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}U_{n,\eta}^0|$, $|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}U_{n,\eta}^\infty|$ and $|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}\psi_{n,\eta}^J|$. Let us estimate them separately.

First, we show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}U_{n,\eta}^0|dx = 0.$$

For each $j \in \mathbb{J}_1$, we approximate $NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)$ by a smooth function with compact support in L^p spaces, denote this function as $\Theta_{j,t}(x)$, so we see

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}U_{n,\eta}^0|\ dx\\ &\leqslant C_{p,J}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)}\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)-\Theta_{j,t}\|_p^{p-1}\|U_{n,\eta}^0\|_p + C_{p,J}(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(J)}\|\Theta_{j,t}\|_{L^{a'(p-1)}}^{p-1})\|U_{n,\eta}^0\|_{L^a}\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Hölder inequality in the last inequality and $1 < a < p, a'$ satisfies $\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{a'} = 1$. So we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}U_{n,\eta}^0|dx \to 0.$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}U_{n,\eta}^\infty|dx = 0.$$

Finally, we prove that

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\lim_{\eta\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\bar{A}_n^J|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}\psi_{n,\eta}^J|dx = 0.$$

Assume $0 < t < T < \widetilde{T}$, let $\bar{J} > J_c$ be specified later, $J_c = J_c(T)$ is given by Remark 4.5, choose $J > \bar{J}$ sufficiently large. Write $\bar{A}_n^J$ into two parts:

$$\bar{A}_n^J = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\,\bar{J}\leqslant j\leqslant J}NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j) + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\,j<\bar{J}}NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\,\bar{J}\leqslant j\leqslant J}NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\big|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}\psi_{n,\eta}^J|dx\\ &\quad\leqslant\big\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\,\bar{J}\leqslant j\leqslant J}NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\big\|_p^{p-1}\|\psi_{n,\eta}^J\|_p\\ &\quad\lesssim\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\,\bar{J}\leqslant j\leqslant J}\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\|_p^p + \varepsilon(J,n)\big)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\|\psi_{n,\eta}^J\|_p\end{aligned}\tag{7.1}$$

Here $\lim_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon(J,n)=0$ and we have used (6.5) again. Moreover, for any $J,\ \eta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|\psi^J_{n,\eta}\|_p &= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_{j,\eta^c}+\psi^J_n\|_p\\ &\leqslant \limsup_{n\to\infty}\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1^c(J)}\Lambda_{j,n}^{3/p}\phi_{j,\eta^c}\|_p+\limsup_{n\to\infty}\|\psi^J_n\|_p.\end{aligned}$$

Using (4.4), we see that there exists a $N_1=N_1(J,\eta)$, such that for any $n>N_1$, $\|\psi^J_{n,\eta}\|_p\leqslant C\sup_{n\geqslant 1}\|u_{0,n}\|_p$. Now let $n>N_1$, in view of Remark 4.5 and noticing that $\bar{J}>J_c$, one sees that (7.1) has an upper bound

$$C\left((\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\,\bar{J}\leqslant j\leqslant J}\|\phi_j\|_p^p)^{(p-1)/p}+|\varepsilon(J,n)|^{(p-1)/p}\right)\sup_{n\geqslant 1}\|u_{0,n}\|_p$$

Since $\sum_{j\geqslant 1}\|\phi_j\|_p^p$ is convergent, we now fix $\bar{J}=\bar{J}(\epsilon)$ such that

$$C\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\,\bar{J}\leqslant j\leqslant J}\|NS(\phi_j)\|_p^{p-1}\sup_{n\geqslant 1}\|u_{0,n}\|_p\leqslant\epsilon. \tag{7.2}$$

Using the fact that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\varepsilon(J,n)=0$, we conclude there exists a $N_2=N_2(\epsilon,J)$, such that $n>N_2$

$$C|\varepsilon(J,n)|^{\frac{p-1}{p}}\sup_{n\geqslant 1}\|u_{0,n}\|_p<\epsilon. \tag{7.3}$$

Gathering the estimates (7.2) and (7.3), we see that for $n>\max\{N_1,N_2\}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1,\,j\geqslant\bar{J}}NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\big|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}\psi^J_{n,\eta}|dx<2\epsilon. \tag{7.4}$$

Considering the estimate of $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(\bar{J})}NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)$, we approximate each $NS(\phi_j)(t,x)$ by $\Theta_{j,t}(x)$ in L^p spaces,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(\bar{J})}NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)\big|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}\psi^J_{n,\eta}|dx\\ &\leqslant C_p\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(\bar{J})}\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)-\Theta_{j,t}\|_p\big)^{p-1}\|\psi^J_{n,\eta}\|_p\\ &\qquad+C_pt^{s_{\sigma(p),p}/2}\|\psi^J_{n,\eta}\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{\sigma(p),p}}_{\sigma(p),\infty}}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(\bar{J})}\|\Theta_{t,x}\|_{L^{(p-1)\sigma(p)'}}\big)^{p-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used Hölder inequality and equivalent definition of Besov spaces (see(1.26)) in deriving the last inequality. From the above, we know $n>N_1$, $\|\psi^J_{n,\eta}\|_p\leqslant C\sup_{n\geqslant 1}\|u_{0,n}\|_p$, so we choose $\Theta_{j,x}$ sufficiently close to $NS(\phi_j)$ so that

$$C_p\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(\bar{J})}\|NS(\Lambda_j\phi_j)-\Theta_{j,t}\|_p\big)^{p-1}\|\psi^J_{n,\eta}\|_p<\epsilon \tag{7.5}$$

while by (4.2) and Proposition 4.2 (iii), note we already take $q = r = \sigma(p), s_{r,p} = s_{\sigma(p),p}$ there,

$$\lim_{J\to\infty}\lim_{\eta\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\|\psi^J_{n,\eta}\right\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{\sigma(p),p}}_{\sigma(p),\sigma(p)}}=0$$

As $\bar{J}$ is independent of J, η, $0 < t < \widetilde{T}$ is fixed, so $\exists J(\epsilon), \forall J > J(\epsilon)$, $\exists \eta(J,\epsilon), \forall \eta > \eta(J,\epsilon)$, $\exists \bar{N} = \bar{N}(\eta, J, \epsilon)$, for $\forall\, n > \bar{N}$

$$C_p t^{1/2s_{\sigma(p),p}}\|\psi^J_{n,\eta}\|_{\dot{B}^{s_{\sigma(p),p}}_{\sigma(p),\infty}}\big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{J}_1(\bar{J})}\|\Theta_{t,x}\|_{L^{(p-1)\sigma(p)'}}\big)^{p-1}<\epsilon \tag{7.6}$$

Gathering (7.4),(7.5) and (7.6), $\exists J(\epsilon), \forall J > J(\epsilon)$, $\exists \eta(J,\epsilon), \forall \eta > \eta(J,\epsilon)$, $\exists \widetilde{N} := \max\{\bar{N}, N_1, N_2\}$, s.t for $\forall\, n > \widetilde{N}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\bar{A}^J_n|^{p-1}|e^{t\Delta}\psi^J_{n,\eta}|dx<4\epsilon.$$

Using the same way as above, one can estimate $|\bar{A}^J_n|\cdot|B^J_n|^{p-1}$ and the details are omitted. □

A Perturbation of the Navier-Stokes equation

We will state some known estimates on Navier-Stokes equations and prove a result on perturbative Navier-Stokes system. First, let us recall two classical inclusions on Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces, one can refer to Chapter 1 in [42] or Chapter 2 in [6] for details.

Proposition A.1 *Assume* $s_1 < s_2$, $1 \leqslant p_2 < p_1 < \infty$, $1 \leqslant q, r \leqslant \infty$, $s_1 - \frac{d}{p_1} = s_2 - \frac{d}{p_2}$, *then*

$$\dot{B}^{s_2}_{p_2,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow\dot{B}^{s_1}_{p_1,q}(\mathbb{R}^d),\quad \dot{F}^{s_2}_{p_2,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow\dot{F}^{s_1}_{p_1,r}(\mathbb{R}^d),\ L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)=\dot{F}^0_{p_1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Between Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces, for $s\in\mathbb{R}, 1\leqslant p<\infty, 1\leqslant q\leqslant\infty$, there holds

$$\dot{B}^s_{p,p\wedge q}\hookrightarrow\dot{F}^s_{p,q}\hookrightarrow\dot{B}^s_{p,p\vee q} \tag{A.1}$$

where $p\wedge q=\min\{p,q\}$, $p\vee q=\max\{p,q\}$.

Now let us recall some known estimates for the NS equation, which were essentially established or hidden in [10, 19, 41, 34] and summarized in [42].

Proposition A.2 *Let* $a\geqslant 0$, $1\leq r\leq p\leq\infty$, $0<\lambda\leq\infty$ *and* $2/\gamma = a + n(1/r - 1/p)$. *Then we have*

$$\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}_+;\dot{B}^0_{p,\lambda})}\leq C\|f\|_{\dot{B}^{-a}_{r,\,\lambda\wedge\gamma}}. \tag{A.2}$$

In addition, if $\gamma\geqslant r>1$, *then*

$$\|e^{t\Delta}f\|_{L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p)}\leq C\|f\|_{\dot{H}^{-a}_r}. \tag{A.3}$$

We remark that (A.3) is a consequence of (A.1), (A.2) and Proposition A.1.

Proposition A.3 *Let $1 \le r \le p \le \infty$ and $1 < \gamma, \gamma_1 < \infty$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{k}{2} + \frac{n}{2}\left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p}\right) - 1, \quad \frac{k}{2} + \frac{n}{2}\left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{p}\right) < 1, \quad k = 0, 1. \tag{A.4}$$

Then we have

$$\|\nabla^k \mathscr{A}_{t_0} f\|_{L^\gamma([t_0,\infty);L^p)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\gamma_1}([t_0,\infty);L^r)}. \tag{A.5}$$

Proposition A.4 *Let $1 \le r \le \infty$, $1 \le q' \le \lambda \le \infty$[2]. Then*

$$\|\mathscr{A}_{t_0} f\|_{L^\infty([t_0,\infty),\dot{B}^0_{r,\lambda})} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}([t_0,\infty),\dot{B}^{-2/q}_{r,\lambda})}. \tag{A.6}$$

As a direct consequence, we have we now give several estimates adapted to our needs.

Corollary A.5 *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}, 3 < p < \infty$, $1 \leqslant q \leqslant \gamma \leqslant \infty$, $1 \leqslant m \leqslant \infty$, $0 < T < \infty$, $\frac{1}{\beta(p)} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{10p}$, then we have*

$$\|e^{t\Delta} u_0\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T} \lesssim \|u_0\|_p, \tag{A.7}$$

$$\|e^{t\Delta} u_0\|_{L^\gamma((0,\infty),\dot{B}^{s+\frac{2}{\gamma}}_{m,q})} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{B}^s_{m,q}}. \tag{A.8}$$

$$\|\mathscr{A}_0 \mathbb{P}\nabla f\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\beta(p)}_T L^{5p/6}_x} \lesssim T^{(1-3/p)/2} \|f\|_{L^{5p/6}_T L^{5p/6}_x}, \tag{A.9}$$

Proof. By Proposition A.3 and Hölder's inequality,

$$\|\mathscr{A}_0 \mathbb{P}\nabla f\|_{L^{5p/3}_T L^{5p/3}_x} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\beta(p)}_T L^{5p/6}_x} \lesssim T^{(1-3/p)/2} \|f\|_{L^{5p/6}_T L^{5p/6}_x}.$$

By Propositions A.4 and A.1, taking $s(p) = 1 - 2/\beta(p) > 0$, we see that

$$\|\mathscr{A}_0 \mathbb{P}\nabla f\|_{L^\infty_T L^p_x} \lesssim \|\mathscr{A}_0 \mathbb{P}\nabla f\|_{L^\infty_T \dot{B}^{s(p)}_{5p/6,5p/6}} \leqslant \|f\|_{L^{\beta(p)}_T \dot{B}^0_{5p/6,5p/6}} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{\beta(p)}_T L^{5p/6}_x}. \tag{A.10}$$

Next, we perform the perturbation analysis for the Navier-Stokes equation. Our approach follows Theorem 3.1 in [16]. Similar conclusions in critical spaces can also be found in [17].

Proposition A.6 *Let $3 < p < \infty$, $w \in \mathfrak{X}^p_T$ be vector fields in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $f \in L^{\beta(p)}_T L^{5p/6}_x$ is a 3×3 matrix function. $\beta(p)$ is the same as* Lemma 6.1*, $0 < T < \infty$, v satisfies the following perturbative NS equation (PNS)*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v & +(v\cdot\nabla)v - \Delta v + (v\cdot\nabla)w + (w\cdot\nabla)v = -\nabla p - \nabla\cdot f \\ \operatorname{div} v & = 0 \\ v_{|t=0} & = v_0\,. \end{cases}$$

[2] p' stands for the conjugate number of p, i.e. $1/p + 1/p' = 1$.

Assume that there exist two constants $\epsilon_0 \ll 1$ and $C \gg 1$ such that

$$\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)} L_x^{5p/6}} \leqslant \epsilon_0 \, T^{-(1-3/p)/2} \exp(-C\, T^{5p(1-3/p)/6} \|w\|^{5p/3}_{L_T^{5p/3} L_x^{5p/3}}).$$

Then v belongs to $\mathfrak{X}_T^p$, moreover we have

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{X}_T^p} \lesssim (\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)} L_x^{5p/6}}) \exp(C\, T^{5p(1-3/p)/6} \|w\|^{5p/3}_{L_T^{5p/3} L_x^{5p/3}})$$

Proof: The Duhamel formula of (PNS) is

$$v = e^{t\Delta} v_0 - \mathscr{B}(v, v) - \mathscr{B}(v, w) - \mathscr{B}(w, v) - \mathscr{A}_0 \mathbb{P} \nabla \cdot f$$

For any time interval $(\alpha, \beta) \subset (0, T)$, we denote $\mathfrak{X}^p_{(\alpha,\beta)} := L^{5p/3}((\alpha, \beta), L_x^{5p/3}) \cap C([\alpha, \beta], L_x^p)$. It follows from Corollary A.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_{(\alpha,\beta)}} \leqslant L(\|v(\alpha)\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{\beta(p)} L_x^{5p/6}}) + L\, T^{(1-3/p)/2} \Big(& \|v\|^2_{L^{5p/3}((\alpha,\beta), L_x^{5p/3})} \\ & + \|v\|_{L^{5p/3}((\alpha,\beta), L_x^{5p/3})} \|w\|_{L^{5p/3}((\alpha,\beta), L_x^{5p/3})} \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

for some constant $L > 1$. Based on this estimate, we can solve (PNS) locally and then extend to the maximal solution, i.e. solution with maximal existence time $T(v_0)$. By the absolute continuity of Lebesgue integral, there exists $N + 1$ real numbers $(T_i)_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant N}$ such that $T_0 = 0$ and $T_N = T$, satifying $[0, T] = \cup_{i=0}^{N-1} [T_i, T_{i+1}]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{8L} \leqslant T^{(1-3/p)/2} \|w\|_{L^{5p/3}((T_i, T_{i+1}), L_x^{5p/3})} \leqslant \frac{1}{4L} \quad \forall i \in \{0, \ldots, N-2\} \\ T^{(1-3/p)/2} \|w\|_{L^{5p/3}((T_{N-1}, T), L_x^{5p/3})} \leqslant \frac{1}{4L}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

By virtue of (A.12), one sees that N satisfying

$$\|w\|^{5p/3}_{L_T^{5p/3} L_x^{5p/3}} \geqslant \sum_{i=0}^{N-2} \int_{T_i}^{T_{i+1}} \|w\|^{5p/3}_{L_x^{5p/3}} dt \geqslant (N-1) \big(\frac{1}{8LT^{(1-3/p)/2}} \big)^{5p/3}. \tag{A.13}$$

Now let us assume that $\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3} L_x^{5p/3}}$ is bounded by

$$(8LT^{(1-3/p)/2} (2L)^5)^{-1} \exp\big[- (8LT^{(1-3/p)/2})^{5p/3} \|w\|^{5p/3}_{L_T^{5p/3} L_x^{5p/3}} \ln(2L) \big]. \tag{A.14}$$

By continuity in time, we define a maximal time $\bar{T} < T(v_0)$ such that

$$T^{(1-3/p)/2} \|v\|_{L^{5p/3}((0,\bar{T}), L^{5p/3})} \leqslant \frac{1}{4L}. \tag{A.15}$$

If $\bar{T} \geqslant T$, then by (A.11), we can get desired conclusion.

If $\bar{T} < T$, then there exists $k \in \{0, \ldots, N-1\}$, such that $T_k \leqslant \bar{T} < T_{k+1}$. Inserting (A.12) and (A.15) into (A.11), we can get for any $1 \leqslant i < k$

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_{(T_i, T_{i+1})}} \leqslant L(\|v(T_i)\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3} L_x^{5p/3}}) + 2^{-1} \|v\|_{L^{5p/3}((T_i, T_{i+1}), L_x^{5p/3})}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{X}^p_{(T_i,T_{i+1})} = L^{5p/3}((T_i,T_{i+1}),L_x^{5p/3}) \cap C([T_i,T_{i+1}],L_x^p)$, so we have

$$\|v(T_{i+1})\|_p \leqslant \|v\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_{(T_i,T_{i+1})}} \leqslant 2L(\|v(T_i)\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}). \tag{A.16}$$

Iterating the above inequality (A.16) with respect to i, $1 \leqslant i < k$

$$\|v(T_i)\|_p \leqslant (2L)^{i+1}(\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}). \tag{A.17}$$

By (A.17) and (A.16), we see

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_{(T_i,T_{i+1})}} \leqslant 2(2L)^{i+2}(\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}).$$

Similarly we have

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_{(T_k,\bar{T})}} \leqslant 2(2L)^{k+2}(\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}).$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned}\|v\|_{L_{\bar{T}}^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}} &\leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \|v\|_{L^{5p/3}((T_i,T_{i+1}),L_x^{5p/3})} + \|v\|_{L^{5p/3}((T_k,\bar{T}),L_x^{5p/3})} \\ &\leqslant (2L)^{N+4}(\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}).\end{aligned}$$

By (A.13) and (A.14), we have

$$\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}} \leqslant \frac{1}{8L(2L)^{N+4}T^{1/2(1-3/p)}}$$

with this we finally obtain

$$T^{1/2(1-3/p)}\|v\|_{L_{\bar{T}}^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}} \leqslant 1/8L,$$

which contradicts the maximality of $\bar{T}$. Therefore, $\bar{T} \geqslant T$, and using the above iteration, we have

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T} \leqslant (2L)^{N+4}(\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}}).$$

Together with the estimate (A.13), we can rewrite the above estimate as

$$\|v\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T} \leqslant C(\|v_0\|_p + \|f\|_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}})\exp(CT^{5p(1-3/p)/6}\|w\|^{5p/3}_{L_T^{5p/3}L_x^{5p/3}})$$

for some constant $C \gg 1$. Hence we complete the proof. □

As a direct consequence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary A.7 *The mapping $w_0 \mapsto T(w_0)$ is lower semi-continuous for (NS) with initial in L^p, $3 < p < \infty$, i.e. for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\eta > 0$, such that if $\|v_0\|_p < \eta$, then $T(w_0 + v_0) \geqslant T(w_0) - \varepsilon$.*

Sketch Proof of Remark 4.5. Considering the map

$$\mathscr{T}:\ u(t)=e^{t\Delta}u_0+\mathscr{B}(u,u), \tag{A.18}$$

by Corollary A.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathscr{T}u\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T}&\leqslant\|e^{t\Delta}u_0\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T}+\|\mathscr{B}(u,u)\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T}\\&\lesssim\|u_0\|_p+T^{(1-3/p)/2}\|u\otimes u\|_{L_T^{5p/6}L_x^{5p/6}}\\&\leqslant\|u_0\|_p+T^{(1-3/p)/2}\|u\|^2_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T}.\end{aligned} \tag{A.19}$$

So, if

$$u\in\mathscr{D}_T:=\{u\in\mathfrak{X}^p_T:\ \|u\|_{\mathfrak{X}^p_T}\leqslant 2C\|u_0\|_p\},$$

we can choose T satisfying $T^{(1-3/p)/2}\|u_0\|_p\leqslant 1/4C^2$. It follows that $\mathscr{T}u\in\mathscr{D}_T$. Using contraction mapping principle, we obtain that NS has a unique solution $u\in\mathfrak{X}^p_T$ and the above proof implies the result of Remark 4.5. □

Acknowledgment. The work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation of China, grants 11271023. The second and third named authors were supported in part by Mathematics and Physics Unit "Multiscale Analysis Moddelling and Simulation", Top Global University Project, Waseda University. Part of the paper was carried out when the first named author was visiting Laboratoire J. A. Dieudonné and he is grateful to Professor Fabrice Planchon for his valuable suggestions and comments and also the support from the China Scholarship Council.

References

[1] B. Abe, The NavierCStokes equations in a space of bounded functions, Commun. Math. Phys. **338**(2015), 849–865.

[2] P. Auscher, S. Dubois and P. Tchamitchian, On the stability of global solutions to Navier–Stokes equations in the space, J. Math. Pures Appl., **83** (2004) 673C697

[3] H. Bae, A. Biswas and E. Tadmor, Analyticity and decay estimates of the Navier–Stokes equations in critical Besov spaces, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **205** (2012), 963–991.

[4] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, Interpolation Spaces, Springer–Verlag, 1976.

[5] J. Bourgain and N. Pavlovic, Ill-posedness of the Navier–Stokes equations in a critical space in 3D. J. Funct. Anal., **255** (2008), 2233–2247.

[6] H. Bahouri, J. Chemin and R. Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations.* Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 343. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.

[7] M. Cannone, Ondelettes, paraproduits et Navier-Stokes. Diderot Editeur, Paris (1995).

[8] M. Cannone, Y. Meyer, Littlewood-Paley decomposition and Navier-Stokes equations, Methods Appl. Anal. **2** (1995), 307–319.

[9] M. Cannone, A generalization of a theorem by Kato on Navier–Stokes equations, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, 13 (1997) 515–541.

[10] J.-Y. Chemin, Théorèmes d'unicité pour le système de Navier–Stokes tridimensionnel, J. Anal. Math., **77** (1999), 27–50.

[11] J.Y. Chemin, I. Gallagher, and M. Paicu, Global regularity for some classes of large solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations, Ann. of Math., **173** (2011), 983–1012.

[12] J. C. Cortissoz, J. A. Montero and C. E. Pinilla, On lower bounds for possible blow-up solutions to the periodic Navier-Stokes equation J. Math. Phys. **55** (2014), 033101.

[13] H. Dong and D. Du, The Navier-Stokes equation in the critical Lebesgue space, Commun. Math. Phys., **292** (2009), 811-827.

[14] L. Escauriaza, G. Seregin and V. Sverak, $L_{3,\infty}$ solutions of Navier–Stokes equations and backward uniquness, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk., **58** (2003), 3–44.

[15] C. Foias and R. Temam, Gevrey class regularity for the solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations. J. Funct. Anal., **87** (1989), 359–369.

[16] I. Gallagher, D. Iftimie and F. Planchon. Asympototics and stability for global solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. *Ann.Inst.Fourier(Grenoble)*, 53(5):1387–1424, 2003.

[17] I. Gallagher, G. S. Koch and F. Planchnon, A profile decomposition approach to the $L_t^\infty(L_x^3)$ Navier-Stokes regularity criterion, Math. Ann. **355** (2013), 1527–1559.

[18] P. Germain, The second iterate for the Navier–Stokes equation. J. Funct. Anal., **255** (2008), 2248–2264.

[19] Y. Giga, Solutions for semilinear parabolic equations in L_p and regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes system, J. Differ. Equations **62** (1986), 182–212.

[20] Y. Giga, K. Inui and S. Matsui, On the Cauchy problem for the Navier-Stokes equations with nondecaying initial data. In: Advances in fluid dynamics, vol. 4 of Quad.Mat., pp. 27-68. Dept.Math., Seconda Univ. Napoli, Caserta (1999).

[21] Y. Giga and T. Miyakawa, Solutions in L^r of the Navier-Stokes initial value problem, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **89** (1985), 267–281.

[22] Y. Giga and T. Miyakawa, Navier-Stokes flow in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with measures as initial vorticity and Morrey spaces, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **14** (1989), 577–618.

[23] P. Gérard, Description du défaut de compacité de l'injection de Sobolev, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **3** (1998), 213–233.

[24] C. Huang and B. Wang, Analyticity for the (generalized) Navier-Stokes equations with rough initial data, arXiv:1310.2141.

[25] T. Iwabuchi, Navier–Stokes equations and nonlinear heat equations in modulation spaces with negative derivative indices, J. Differential Equations, **248** (2010), 1972–2002.

[26] T. Kato, Strong L^p solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^m$ with applications to weak solutions, Math. Z., **187** (1984), 471–480.

[27] C. E. Kenig, G. S. Koch, An alternative approach to regularity for the Navier–Stokes equations in critical spaces, Ann. l'Inst. H. Poincare (C) Non Linear Anal., **28** (2011), 159-187.

[28] C. E. Kenig, F. Merle, Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy critical focusing nonlinear wave equations, Acta Math., **201** (2008), 147–212.

[29] H. Koch, D. Tataru, Well-posedness for the Navier–Stokes equations, Adv. Math., **157** (2001) 22–35.

[30] G. S. Koch, Profile decompositions for critical Lebesgue and Besov space embeddings. *Indiana Univ. Math.J.*, **59** (2010), 1801–1830.

[31] G. S. Koch, N. Nadirashvili, G.A. Seregin, V. Sverak, Liouville theorems for the Navier-Stokes equations and applications, Acta Math., **203** (2009), 83-105.

[32] H. Kozono, T. Ogawa, Y. Taniuchi, The critical Sobolev inequalities in Besov spaces and regularity criterion to some semi-linear evolution equations, Math. Z., **242** (2002), 251–278.

[33] J. Leray, Sue le mouvemeblt d'ubl liouide visoueux emplissant l'espace, Acta Math., **63** (1934), 193–248.

[34] F. Planchon, Global strong solutions in Sobolev or Lebesgue spaces to the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^3$, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare, AN, **13** (1996), 319–336.

[35] F. Planchon. Asymptotic behavior of global solutions to the Navier - Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 14(1):71–93, 1998.

[36] G. Ponce, R. Racke, T. C. Sideris, and E. S. Titi, Global stability of large solutions to the 3D Navier-Stokes equations, Comm. Math. Phys. **159** (1994), 329–341.

[37] E. Poulon. About the possibility of minimal blow up for Navier-Stokes solutions with data in $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^3)$. *arXiv : 1505.06197*, May 2015.

[38] G. Seregin, A certain necessary condition of potential blow up for Navier-Stokes equations, Comm. Math. Phys., **312** (2012), 833–845.

[39] J. C. Robinson, W. Sadowski and R. P. Silva, Lower bounds on blow up solutions of the three dimensional Navier-Stokes equations in homogeneous Sobolev spaces, Journal of Mathematical Physics, **53**, (2012) 115618-1–15.

[40] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces,* Birkhäuser–Verlag, 1983.

[41] B. Wang, Exponential Besov spaces and their applications to certain evolution equations with dissipations, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal., **3** (2004), 883–919.

[42] B. Wang, Z. Huo, C. Hao and Z. Guo, *Harmonic analysis method for nonlinear evolution equations. I.* World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2011.

[43] B. Wang, L. Zhao, B. Guo, Isometric decomposition operators, function spaces $E^{\lambda}_{p,q}$ and their applications to nonlinear evolution equations, J. Funct. Anal., **233** (2006), 1–39.

[44] B. Wang, Ill-posedness for the Navier-Stokes equation in critical Besov spaces $\dot{B}^{-1}_{\infty,q}$, Adv. in Math., **268** (2015), 350–372.

[45] F. B. Weissler, The Navier-Stokes initial value problem in Lp, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **74** (1980), 219–230.

[46] T. Yoneda, Ill-posedness of the 3D Navier–Stokes equations in a generalized Besov space near BMO^{-1}. J. Funct. Anal., **258** (2010), 3376–3387.